THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
PATRISTIC STUDIES
VOL. VII.

THE CLAUSULAE IN THE DE CIVITATE DEI OF ST. AUGUSTINE

A Dissertation

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF LETTERS OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF
AMERICA, IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

THE REVEREND GRAHAM REYNOLDS, B. A., LICENCIÉ ÈS LETTRES.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1924

THOMAE IOSEPH SHAHAN

PONTIFICI

LIBERALISSIMO PATRONO SCRIPTOR

HVNC LIBELLVM BENEFICIORVM PLVRIMORVM MEMOR

SVMMA OBSERVANTIA DEDICAVIT.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Baehrens, W. A., Zu Florus, Wiener Studien, 1912, p. 402.

Bayard, L., Le Latin de St. Cyprien, Paris, 1902.

Beltrami, A., Il "numerus" e Frontone, Rivista di Filologia, 36, 1908, p. 545.

Bornecque, H., La prose métrique dans la correspondance de Cicéron, Paris, 1898.

—— La prose métrique et le dialogue des orateurs, Revue de Philologie, 23, 1899, p. 334.

—— Les lois métriques de la prose oratoire latine d'après le panégyrique de Trajan, Rev. de Phil., 24, 1900, p. 201.

—— Wie soll man die metrischen Klauseln studieren? Rheinisches Museum, 58, 1903, p. 371.

—— Les clausules métriques dans Florus, Musée Belge, 7, 1903, p. 16.

—— Les clausules métriques dans Minucius Félix, Musée Belge, 7, 1903, p. 247.

—— Les clausules métriques latines, Lille, 1907.

Broadhead, H. D., Latin Prose Rhythm, Cambridge, 1922.

di Capua, F., Le clausole in S. Agostino con tre sillabe atone fra i due accenti, Bollettino di Filologia Classica, 1912, p. 12.

—— L'evoluzione della prosa metrica latina nei primi tre secoli D. C. e la data dell' Ottavio di Minucio, Didaskaleion, 1913, p. 1.

Clark, A. C., Fontes Prosae Numerosae, Oxford, 1909.

—— The Cursus in Mediaeval and Vulgar Latin, Oxford, 1910.

Clark, C. U., Ammianus Marcellinus, Berlin, 1910.

De Groot, A. W., De Numero Oratorio Latino Commentatio, The Hague, 1919.

—— A Handbook of Antique Prose-Rhythm, The Hague, 1919.

Harmon, A. M., The Clausula in Ammianus Marcellinus, New Haven, 1910.

Havet, L., La prose métrique de Symmaque et les origines du cursus, Paris, 1892.

Hingher, R., Possessivpronomen und Prosarhythmus bei Tacitus, Tübingen, 1922.

de Jonge, E., Les clausules métriques dans St. Cyprien, Louvain, 1905.

Jordan, H., Rhythmische Prosa in der altchristlichen lateinischen Literatur, Leipzig, 1905.

Laurand, L., La théorie du cursus dans Saint Augustin, Recherches de sciences religieuses, 4, 1913, p. 569.

Lietzmann, H., Fünf Festpredigten Augustins in gereimter Prosa, Bonn, 1905.

Lindsay, W. M., The Latin Language, Oxford, 1894.

Norden, E., Die Antike Kunstprosa, Leipzig, 1909.

Rose, H. J., The Clausulae of the Pauline Corpus, The Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. 25, 1923.

Sabbadini, R., Del numerus in Floro, Riv. di Fil., 25, 1897, p. 600.

Steeger, T., Die Klauseltechnik Leos des Groszen in seinen Sermonen, Haszfurt, 1908.

Thomas, E., Pétrone, Paris, 1912.

Watson, W. E., The Style and Language of St. Cyprian, Oxford, 1896.

Zielinski, T., Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden, Philologus, S. B. 9, 1904.

—— Das Ausleben des Clauselgesetzes in der roemischen Kunstprosa, Philologus, S. B. 10, 1907.

PREFACE.

The object of this dissertation is to investigate the clausulae, or clause endings, of the *De Civitate Dei*, from the point of view of their metrical or rhythmical form; to find whether they are marked by a care and attention on the part of the writer as to such form; to recognize, tabulate and classify these metrical endings according as they resemble or differ from one another; to see by what laws they are governed, what sort of a system they constitute, and what essentially they are; to note the proportion of preference given to each of the possible varieties; and to see what relation all this bears to the general practice of ancient prose writers. In addition we shall consider the light that is thrown by the writer's metrical practice upon the prosody of the language that he used.

St. Augustine has not received the attention from students of ancient artistic prose which the great thinker and trained rhetorician that he was, deserved. In particular he has been passed over by students of the clausula. Very little has been done professedly toward the study of the metrical composition of his prose; and most scholars are content to dismiss him with a passing reference to the fact that his clausulae are rhythmical and with the quotation of a few examples. Yet his importance from a purely literary point of view is very great. Though he clearly wrote for utility rather than for beauty, though his works belong, for the most part, in the class of text-books more than in that of literature, yet no man of his age showed greater independence and originality of style, and no Father of any age has had so great an influence on the Latin of subsequent writers. He does not, it is true, use the language of Livy and Caesar, but neither does he write in the debased jargon of an outlander. His language is that of an educated and scholarly citizen of Rome, well acquainted with the best monuments of her literature, ancient and recent. And he is in some considerable degree the originator of standard ecclesiastical Latin: he moulded and gave currency to the form that has been followed ever since by careful and instructed Church writers. One acquainted with no other Latin than that of the best theologians from the Middle Ages to the present day, will find the language of St. Augustine

ix

familiar. The same cannot be said of most of the other Fathers of the Church; perhaps not of any except St. Ambrose and St. Jerome. But it was not left to a later age to appreciate his importance. His was the greatest mind of his day, and his contemporaries read him, and, whether they wished it or not, imitated him.

The *De Civitate Dei* is generally conceded to be his most carefully written work from the point of view of form. Consequently it is the natural choice to be made for any study of his literary style. Here, if anywhere, we shall find the rules that he acknowledged and the rules that he followed as guides to correct and formal literary composition. And this applies to the clausula as well as to any other factor of rhetoric. What St. Augustine's literary clausulae are will appear from an examination of the *De Civitate Dei*. It must be remembered that much that St. Augustine wrote was in no sense, or only in the vaguest sense literature; and further that his sermons being popular and oral, are to be judged by an entirely different set of canons from those that apply to formal literary works. It would be next to impossible to undertake a study of the clausula in the entire works of so voluminous a writer. It is almost a necessity to limit the investigation to a single work. The standard can be found here; but it must be borne in mind that it is the standard for writings of some literary pretentions, not the standard for text-books and commentaries. The extent of its application can be a proper subject of other and further studies. For the criterion is consistency rather than extent, and this can be observed from comparatively few pages. The second element in the determination of the rules of the clausula is frequency; and to discover this only so much matter is needed as is sufficient to assure a fair degree of approximation to the average. And so we may count on arriving at a knowledge of the essential nature of the Augustinian clausula from an examination of the practice in the *De Civitate Dei*.

The student of such a problem is fortunate in being able to use as the material of his examination the excellent edition of Emanuel Hoffmann in the Vienna Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Its convenience and reliability make the investigator's work easy. As its claim to be the standard edition of the *De Civitate Dei* is hardly open to dispute I have regarded it in this light.

All references are made to it, and all the examples cited are taken from it. I therefore follow Hoffmann's orthography and reading in every case, and his word division even where I disagree with it.

I have attempted to present my work in a form consonant with the general practice of writers on this subject; but the divergencies among them are so great, and among the best of them the manner of treatment depends so much on the peculiarities of the individual writer studied, that inevitably I have been forced to depend in many respects on no other guide than my own judgment or taste.

INTRODUCTION.

The word *clausula* means the ending of a clause. As a technical term in rhetorical study it means that ending when it is subjected to a particular treatment from the point of view of sound. In this sense the clausula may be defined as an arrangement of the sound elements of the last part of a group of words constituting a unit of composed speech so as to give a cadence striking to the ear and psychologically agreeable, for reasons which so far, I believe, escape our knowledge, to pause. This effect may be produced by means of rhythm or of metre or of both.[1] The principal forms in Latin are: 1. | ⏑ ⏑ − | ⏑ ⏑ ≍ [2] (*esse debemus*), 2. | ⏑ ⏑ − | ⏑ ⏑ ≍ (*esse contenderit*), and 3. | ⏑ ⏑ − | − ⏑ | ⏑ ⏑ ≍ (*proximo consulamus*). Corresponding forms in English will convey some idea of the effect. *Always unwilling* 1., *merely comparative* 2., and *classical education* 3. are rhythmical. Both metrical and rhythmical are: 1. *strongly built book case,* 2. *that's a hard test to pass,* 3. *twelve o'clock Wednesday morning.* Out of these forms many varieties naturally arise. Metrical prose is that in which every considerable pause is marked by the use of one of these forms or of one of its subsidiary varieties.

Research in the field of metrical prose is too new to have become either hampered or protected by canons rigorously applied and universally accepted. Every investigator is in some measure a free lance. No method can yet be said to have won the position of authority, though probably that of Zielinski has deserved it. And the advocates of various methods continue to this day to dispute their rival claims. Therefore, it is necessary before beginning an investigation to make some attempt to reach a conclusion on the merits of the various methods proposed; and to adopt one of them or a mixture of them, or to devise a new one.

I leave wholly out of account those theories and writers and methods that are concerned with the problem of metrical prose

---

[1] The word *metre* is used throughout this dissertation with reference to quantity; *rhythm* with reference to accent, except in one case, where its different use is noted.

[2] The last syllable is anceps as in verse.

1

outside of the clausula, as well as those that deal with Greek. To discuss these, though by no means impertinent, would take us too far afield. We shall consider here only the question of the method to be followed in examining the nature of the clausula as it is found in a Latin writer and specifically in a writer of late Latin.

The earliest method to be fully formulated is that of Bornecque. It is the one that has generally been followed by French scholars. It consists in the classification of the clause endings according to their final words in the first instance, and in the second according to the various arrangements of syllables that are admitted to precede a final of a given type. It deals only with quantity and caesura. According to it the law governing the clausula is that the metrical form of the final word determines the metrical form of the word that precedes it. It has two great advantages that are at once apparent, it is a method simple and easy to follow, and it cannot, since its theory is so simple, lead into positive error. That it can however fail fully to discover the truth is clear from Bornecque's own conclusion that the principle governing the writing of metrical prose is to avoid such sentence endings as resemble the ends of verses. It is by no means any such purely negative principle that produced the majestic measures of Cicero's orations. On the whole it is a theory of negation and does little toward an understanding of what the clausula essentially is. It seems to me to suffer also from the defect of being unreasonable. It is working backward to say that the last word determines that which precedes it; whatever the nature of the clausula it must flow from its first syllable. However, the finals offer a ready and convenient means of classification. It suffers further from inconsistency in that it admits as final words word groups which resemble single words only metrically and are not always of such close grammatical coherence as to be legitimately regarded as single words. This is really to negative its fundamental principle. If *iteratum* and *et amoris* are identical for purposes of the clausula, then the clausula is not determined by the final *word*. In description this sounds like a small difficulty but it is one that furnishes real embarrassment to the student. Who is to tell him what word group is to be taken as a final? The answer is based on metrical principles that result only at the end of the investigation. However, I am convinced that scholars can never dispense wholly with Bornecque's

method. In the first place the fact of dealing with words as the elements of which the clausula is made renders it a true guide to the nature of the clausula in so far as that depends on caesura, and the importance of the caesura in the essential nature of the clausula is absolutely *fundamental: dicerent esse* and *esse dicebant* are closely related but are not the same clausula. In the second place to classify the types of sentence endings according to the final words will in practice bring to light metrical facts that will escape the eye of an investigator whose method of attack is an *a priori* application of Zielinski's system.

The most pretentious and complete theory of the clausula that has yet been set forth is that of Zielinski.[3] It has gained very wide acceptance, but at the same time it has been widely and vehemently attacked. But I think it must be admitted that at least in the main it is right. The attacks upon it have not, so far at least as I have observed, been made with other weapons than rhetoric. Certainly Zielinski has made a more exhaustive investigation than any other, and it is not surprising that he should be the one to reveal the truth. Beginning with all of the material that existed he took first what was incontestably certain, then that which differed from it in the least degree, then that which showed a wider divergence, and so built up a coherent and logical system of classification that was based wholly on objective facts and out of which he induced a theory that presented for the first time a comprehensible notion of the essential nature of the clausula. To this system he adds many laws, or perhaps it would be better to say by-laws, which he observed to govern the use of the clausula in Cicero's orations; but many of which are peculiar to Cicero, or, at least, do not universally apply elsewhere. But the clausula as a phenomenon of well written Latin prose is in its essence such as Zielinski has described it. According to this theory the clausula consists of a "base," which is a cretic, followed by a trochaic "cadence" of one or more feet, the last foot being either a trochee or a cretic. The increase through the series of types is by half-feet, so that the series is: Type 1, cretic + trochee; Type 2, cretic + cretic; Type 3, cretic + two trochees; Type 4, cretic + trochee + cretic and so on. Any long syllable may be resolved into two

<hr/>

[3] Th. Zielinski, "Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden," *Philologus*, 1904, S. B. 9, p. 589.

shorts. The coincidence of word accent and ictus is preferred. Certain licences are occasionally permitted: a spondee is sometimes substituted for a trochee, the base may be a molossus, a choriambus or an epitrite. These licences, which are reasonable and, except for the molossus, not frequent, have been made the text of most of the hostile criticism of the system. Doubtless investigations made with Zielinski's thoroughness into other authors than Cicero would throw much light on the subject, and would enable us to distinguish more exactly what is essential to the clausula from what is accidental; but they will not overthrow his structure, and they will not show the clausula to be substantially different from what he has described it as being.

The contention of De Groot [4] that before we can speak of a clausula we must show that the succession of syllables composing it is rarer out of pause than in pause will not stand the test of application to a late writer whose clausulae are stamped by accent rhythms with the clarity of a label; and therefore need not detain us here. But I do not think his system is sound in any case, since it can be useful only in so far as it deals with successions of syllables that are pronounced together and end with the end of a word; and even so can only show how far a clausula does violence to the average inherent syllable succession of Latin speech. Its principal value lies in the light it sheds on the purely psychological problem of how much difficulty the construction of a clausula involved, and how much deliberate effort it therefore involved on the part of the writer. But here its evidence is uncertain since so many other elements come into the psychological problem, such as the extent to which the writer had imbibed from his reading the habit of forming clausulae, and the extent to which the words proper to the end of a sentence differ in their metrical character from those which make up its course, and the rhythmic idiosyncrasies of the individual writer's nervous system, and others.

One other point in theory must be touched on, and that is the contention that there is no rhythm [5] except in the repeated occurrence of the same succession of syllables. Certainly rhythm *is* repetition; but in _ ∪ _ ∪ there is repetition, and likewise in _ ∪ _ _ ∪,

[4] A. W. De Groot, *Handbook of Antique Prose-Rhythm.*
[5] Hereafter I use the word *rhythm* exclusively in reference to accent.

and therefore these forms are in themselves individually rhythmical cadences, and strike the ear as such.[6]

In attacking the problem of investigating the clausulae of the *De Civitate Dei* I first attempted the direct application of Zielinski's method. I went about to describe each sentence ending, as I found it, in the terminology of his system, intending afterwards to group them for classification. I soon found that I was hopelessly at sea. I then fell back on Bornecque's method and divided them according to their final words, and these groups according to the next last word; thereupon I found that each division was nine-tenths uniform and could be identified either as one of Zielinski's types or as something closely resembling it, with the exception of one or two striking types which will be found accounted for in their place. From this I was able to build up a system of classification of the Augustinian clausulae. This system I based on Zielinski's as closely as possible, following his divisions and employing his nomenclature, and extending both in a way to embrace the forms which I found that he does not include. From this resulted the fact that the Augustinian system, while not the Ciceronian, is a natural descendant of it and embodies the same underlying principle.

---

[6] This is stated by St. Augustine as his own opinion of what constitutes rhythm. Cf. *De Musica*, VI, 10, 26.

CHAPTER I.

The Clausula in the " De Civitate Dei."

In his treatise on Christian Doctrine St. Augustine says: Cur pietatis doctorem pigeat imperitis loquentem, ossum potius quam os dicere, ne ista syllaba non ab eo quod sunt ossa, sed ab ea quod sunt ora intelligatur, ubi Afrae aures de correptione vocalium vel productione non iudicant?[1]   I quote this passage to discard it. However African St. Augustine's ears may once have been they had become thoroughly Italianized; and the *De Civitate Dei* was not written for the unlearned. Indeed if these words prove anything pertinent it is that to St. Augustine and to his readers the difference between a *vocalis correpta* and a *vocalis producta* was a real and great one, for the ignoring of which he must plead in the interest of simple souls.

Elsewhere in the same work he comments on the translation of *Romans,* xiii, 14, *sed induite Dominum Jesum Christum, et carnis providentiam ne feceritis in concupiscentiis:* Quod si quisquam ita diceret, Et carnis providentiam ne in concupiscentiis feceritis; sine dubio aures clausula numerosiore mulceret: sed gravior interpres etiam ordinem maluit tenere verborum. Quomodo autem hoc in graeco eloquio sonet, quo est locutus Apostolus, viderint ejus eloquii usque ad ista doctiores: mihi tamen quod nobis eodem verborum ordine interpretatum est, nec ibi videtur currere numerose.[2]

[1] De Doctrina Christiana IV, 10. (Ed. S. Benedicti).

I translate this: Why should a teacher of religion, addressing the unlearned here in Africa, where the ears of the people are insensible to the length or shortness of vowels, disdain to use the word *ossum* instead of *os*, lest this latter be understood, not of the word whose plural is *ossa*, but of that whose plural is *ora*.

[2] Ibid. IV, 20.

I translate this: Now, doubtless, if one should say, Et carnis providentiam ne in concupiscentiis feceritis, one would gratify our ears with a more rhythmical sentence ending; but the more conscientious translator has preferred to retain even the order of the words. But how this sounds in the Greek language, which the Apostle spoke, is a question for those whose learning in that language is sufficiently profound to give them a knowledge of these matters. To me however it seems that not even there does that which has been translated for us with the same word order, run rhythmically.

6

Two things are to be considered: the preference from the point of view of metre of one order of words over the other, and the condemnation of the Greek, which inasmuch as he expressly disclaims all knowledge of the metrical rules which prevail in Greek, may safely be said to be made in accordance with the rules for Latin. 1. Concupiscentiis ($|-\smile-|-\smile-$) is Form 2, perfect in quantity and perhaps in accent. This form terminates one-tenth of the sentences of the *De Civitate Dei,* but never, so far as I have found, without caesura. It is this lack which makes the clausula a poor one. The secondary accent of Latin words is a matter of some uncertainty. If the word is accented *concúpiscéntiis* then it is a much poorer form, which instead of occurring once in ten times does not occur once in a hundred. To it is preferred *concupiscentiis feceritis* ($|\acute{}\,\smile-|-\smile|\acute{}\,\smile$) which is an example of Type 3, the best and most sonorous of all the clausulae, perfect in quantity and accent, and having the favourite caesura. There is, I think, no reasonable doubt that this *i* was long at the time of St. Augustine. 2. The Greek words are: ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας ($\acute{}\,\smile-\smile\smile-\acute{}\,-$), which gives a combination of quantity and accent impossible in Latin except with a different caesura. If we shift the accent of the last word to the antepenult we get a form of worse than doubtful propriety, but which I have found once or twice.

The succeeding paragraph of *De Doctrina Christiana* gives St. Augustine's view on the whole subject of the clausulae, and deserves to be quoted in full:

Sane hunc elocutionis ornatum, qui numerosis fit clausulis, deesse fatendum est auctoribus nostris. Quod utrum per interpretes factum sit, an (quod magis arbitror) consulto illi haec plausibilia devitaverint, affirmare non audeo, quoniam me fateor ignorare. Illud tamen scio, quod si quisquam hujus numerositatis peritus illorum clausulas eorumdem numerorum lege componat, quod facillime fit mutatis quibusdam verbis, quae tantumdem significatione valent, vel mutato eorum quae invenerit ordine; nihil illorum quae velut magna in scholis grammaticorum aut rhetorum didicit, illis divinis viris defuisse cognoscet: et multa reperiet locutionis genera tanti decoris, quae quidem et in nostra, sed maxime in sua lingua decora sunt, quorum nullum in eis, quibus isti inflantur, litteris invenitur. Sed cavendum est ne divinis gravibusque sententiis, dum additur numerus, pondus detrahatur. Nam illa musica dis-

ciplina, ubi numerus iste plenissime discitur, usque adeo non defuit Prophetis nostris, ut vir doctissimus Hieronymus quorumdam etiam metra commemoret, in hebraea dumtaxat lingua : cujus ut veritatem servaret in verbis, haec inde non transtulit. Ego autem ut de sensu meo loquar, qui mihi quam aliis et quam aliorum est utique notior, sicut in meo eloquio, quantum modeste fieri arbitror, non praetermitto istos numeros clausularum ; ita in auctoribus nostris hoc mihi plus placet, quod ibi eos rarissime invenio.[3]

From this I think that we may justly conclude that the use of metrical clausulae was a device of well written prose which at St. Augustine's time was not only well known but expected in any writer of consideration ; that the prose of the Latin Bible (and this must mean both the older versions and St. Jerome's) was not metrical ; that prose which was not metrical could easily be made so by a little judicious manipulation ; that St. Augustine himself viewed the precepts of the schoolmasters with a certain amount of contempt ; that he found the use of clausulae prevalent in his time

---

[3] *De Doctrina Christiana*, IV, 20.

I translate this : Certainly it must be admitted that this literary embellishment, which consists in rhythmical sentence endings, is wanting in the sacred writers. But whether this is due to the translators or, as I am more inclined to think, the writers deliberately avoided these claptraps, I should not dare to say, for I admit I do not know. But of this I am sure, that if anyone who is skilled in this rhythmical art should arrange their sentence endings according to the law of like rhythms,—which is easily done by exchanging certain words for others that mean the same thing or by altering the order of those that are found, he will realize that those great and holy men lacked none of the arts which he learned to value in the schools of the grammarians and rhetoricians. And he will find many kinds of literary composition of as great beauty, which, though also in ours, yet in their language are especially beautiful, not one of which is found in the writings in which these jingling tunes are sounded. But in dealing with sacred and serious words there is danger that by adding rhythm to them we detract from their force. For our prophets were so far from being ignorant of the musical art, in which more than anywhere else knowledge of this matter of rhythm is acquired, that the learned Jerome makes mention even of metrical verses in some of them,—that is, in the original Hebrew. For, in the interest of verbal veracity, he has not preserved these in his translation. However, as far as my own personal taste is concerned, which of course I know better than anyone else and better than I know anyone's else, just as in my own writing, in so far as I think their use reasonable I do not neglect these rhythms of the sentence endings, so in the sacred writers I am the better pleased that I do not there find them at all frequent.

excessive and wearisome; and that his own practice was not in accordance with that of his contemporaries, nor yet with that of the translators of the Scriptures into Latin. We are not justified in concluding that he uses the clausulae rarely. I question the correctness of the translation " with restraint." What he says is that in his own practice he does not neglect these cadences of the sentence endings, in so far as he thinks their use reasonable. The use of the word *praetermitto* is especially to be noted. It does not mean, " I do not scruple to use a formal clausula once in a while," but, " I do not pass over the end of the sentence without care of its metrical form." I believe that his limitation refers to the exclusion of monotonous adherence to the few forms recommended by the schools, and that there is here no question of frequency. But if the other view be accepted, then St. Augustine unconsciously made a practice of using a large number of formal clausulae, of a secondary degree of excellence, which he did not recognize as such, and used them wherever he did not use those of the first class. Either view may be correct, and perhaps the truth really lies between them. Certainly the deliberate occasional use of perfect forms would tend to induce the constant partly conscious use of similar forms. And certainly such a practice, in so far as it was realized, would accord with his intention of breaking away from the tiresome and unnatural literary practice of the age in which he had been a school boy, in favour of a greater freedom and vigour, and in imitation of the great masters of ancient and better days. The precise analysis and determination of the psychological processes by which this took place is impossible and not important.[4]

St. Augustine was well acquainted with the writings of Cicero. The most cursory examination of the *De Civitate Dei* alone will be enough to convince a reader of his familiar knowledge of almost all the great writers of classical antiquity. He could not have escaped their influence. And it is probable that he was more influenced by Cicero than by any of the others. His grammar and diction, allowing for the changes that had taken place in the language in four hundred years, and having become accomplished facts were beyond the assent or dissent of any individual writer,

---

[4] Cf. also the quotations from *De Musica* collected by Laurand, *Recherches de Sciences Religieuses*, 1913, p. 569, on St. Augustine's doctrine regarding the kind of feet suitable to prose metres.

show a fairly close approximation to the standards of the classical period. Although he was the defender of simplicity against pedantic classicism, he is a representative of a movement of return to Cicero and the Golden Age. Indeed the preciosity which he scorned was that of his immediate predecessors in the field of literature, and the classics must have appeared to him in bright contrast with the formalism of the third and fourth centuries. It is natural then that in the matter of metrics, too, he should have been drawn to the practice of the ancient writers. He found in Cicero a far greater freedom and variety in the use of metrical endings than was current among the writers of his own day. And he turned to this freedom and variety as his own standard. Some of his forms, I believe, are directly due to the reading of Cicero; some to an uninformed imitation of Cicero's avoidance of monotony. (I am speaking of Cicero in contrast, of course, to the writers of the fourth century, not those of the first.) St. Augustine did not thoroughly understand the laws governing the use of the clausula in Cicero, nor is it probable that he would have wished to follow them consistently if he had done so. In any case accent had become far too strong an element of the Latin language to allow it ever to be possible for him to make his own Cicero's system of prose metres.

The clausulae of the *De Civitate Dei* are not merely rhythmical.[5] While rhythm enters into their composition, their essential character is a matter of quantity rather than of accent. They represent a natural stage in the development of the clausula forms through the course of time. And these forms are metrical in their origin, and are still metrical in the hands of St. Augustine.[6] But this development has taken place under the influence of an ever increasing importance of the accent, and this influence has had its effect. It may be said of the clausulae as we find them here, that the stuff of which they are made is metrical but that the frame in which they are bound is rhythmical. For they are subject to precise and rigidly applied laws of accent. Further than this, they admit of a considerable measure of metrical licence in the introduction of irrational syllables; but this licence is subject to rules,

---

[5] This is the opinion of Canon Watson. Cf. *Class. Rev.*, XV, p. 65.

[6] That is in the *De Civitate Dei*. This remark does not apply to the sermons. The whole matter of style in them is different.

and is only an extension of that which has its beginnings in Cicero. Their metrical character is proved, in the first place, by the great preponderance of metrically perfect forms. The fundamental types | ‒ ⏑ ‒ | ‒ ⏓ (*nomen accepit*), | ‒ ⏑ ‒ | ‒ ⏑ ⏓ (*possumus credere*), and | ‒ ⏑ ‒ | ‒ ⏑ | ‒ ⏓ (*gaudiis destitutum*) together end forty per cent. of all the sentences. This is the same proportion as in Cicero.[7] All forms of the clausula admit of the resolution of a long syllable into two shorts, provided they are in the same word. This resolution leaves the form metrically intact but completely changed rhythmically. Further, two elements which are rhythmically alike and metrically unlike play quite different rôles in the composition of the clausulae; while two that are rhythmically different and metrically similar play identical rôles. A final iambic word is preceded by a spondee three times as often as by a cretic, and almost never by a trochee; whereas a final trochaic word is preceded by a trochee as often as by a spondee, and by a cretic more than ten times as often as either. And a final tribrach is treated exactly as a final trochee. In the light of these facts it is inadmissible to describe the Augustinian clausula as fundamentally rhythmical. The most accurate description is to say that it is at once both metrical and rhythmical, for both the distribution of the quantities and the positions of the accents are regulated by constant and consistent laws.

An unwarrantable practice has crept into too general use, even among scholars of the first rank, of speaking of the clausulae of St. Augustine and of his contemporaries as being a mixture of forms sometimes metrical and sometimes rhythmical. The mere statement of this view ought to be its refutation. It is inconceivable that the same author in the same work would mix together sentences whose cadences depended by turn on two totally different principles. And if any author did so the result would be the most amazing medley imaginable. This statement has been somewhat hastily made; and undoubtedly what is really meant is merely that the same rhythm may be found in two clausulae that are not metrically the same. This, at any rate, is the case with the clausulae of St. Augustine as they are found in the *De Civitate Dei*.

---

[7] Cf. Zielinski, " Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros Reden," Table. The percentage of 1, 2 and 3 together is 44.4.

The following list shows the principal or fundamental forms.
The symbols are explained later.

|⸜∪–|⸜≍	1. insolenter auferri.
|⸜∪–|⸜∪≍	2. coepisse Sallustius.
|⸜∪–|–∪|⸜≍	3. diutius permaneret.
⸜–∪≍	[2]. gustauerunt eam.
⸜–∪⸜≍	[3]. honorandos putarunt.
|⸜∪–|–∪|⸜∪≍	4. scientiā sed superbiā.
|–∪|⸜∪≍	(4). liberatio.
|⸜∪–|–∪|–∪|⸜≍	5. ultimae retributionis.
|–∪|–∪|⸜≍	(5). curare noluerunt.
|⸜∪–|–∪|–∪|⸜∪≍	6. seruus est propriae libidinis.
|–∪|–∪|⸜∪≍	(6). esse conprehenditur.
|–∪|–∪|–∪|⸜≍	(7). resurrectionis adstruendam.

All of the other forms which occur are varieties of these funda-
mental types. Not all types admit the same licences, nor admit
them to the same degree. The variants of Type 3 are much better[7]
clausulae than those of any other type, with the exception of varia-
tion by resolution. These secondary 3 forms may be grouped to-
gether under the following graphic representation.

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} |⸜∪–| \\ |⸜∪∪| \\ |∪∪–| \end{array}\right\} \left\{\begin{array}{c} |–∪|⸜≍ \\ |––|⸜≍ \\ |∪–|⸜≍ \end{array}\right.$$

Naturally there are all degrees of difference in the propriety
of these different forms. Some are of constant occurrence and
some comparatively rare.

In the designation of the clausulae I have taken as a standard
Zielinski's system of symbols as the only one having any serious
pretentions to universal acceptance. According to this system the
different types of clausula are designated by numbers. As the
clausula consists of a (theoretically) cretic base and a cadence of
trochees, 1 is cretic followed by trochee, 2 is cretic followed by a
trochee and a half, 3 is cretic followed by two trochees, 4 is cretic
followed by two trochees and a half, and so on. When any long
syllable is resolved into two shorts, this is indicated by attaching

---

[7] The only standard by which a clausula is " better " or " poorer," is
that of the frequency of its occurrence. Cf. p. 17.

to the number indicating the clausula an exponent which is the number of the syllable resolved, the short syllables being skipped in the numbering since they do not enter into the matter of resolution. Thus, $|\perp \smile \smile| \perp \asymp$, (*esse videatur*) is 1^2, and $|\smile\smile -|- \smile|\smile\asymp$, (*nihil erat credibilius*) is 3^{14}. The caesurae are indicated by the letters of the Greek alphabet placed after the figure denoting the clausula type. *Iudicent dignos* is 1aδ; *perfecta consumtio* is 2γ. As the Augustinian clausula system is not the Ciceronian I have been under the necessity of adding some distinguishing indications of my own. These do no violence to Zielinski's system; they are practically self-explanatory, but will be explained when the clausulae in which they are used are discussed; and their employment only serves to represent graphically the fact that in St. Augustine the clausulae are found in a state of late development and, to a considerable extent, of decay. They do not constitute an original system as in Cicero, nor a system regulated and controlled by rhetoricians and grammarians as in St. Cyprian, but rather the remains of such a system, as it is rapidly falling to pieces.

The question as to where a clausula is found is one that no two persons will answer quite alike. The clausula occurs at a pause. But in determining what kind of a pause is to be regarded as sufficient for this purpose, the criterion cannot but be largely subjective. My own experience is that one is more liable to skip over clausulae than to look for them where they are not. The slightest pause, as for example, at the end of a group of modifiers, before an interruption, after the last of two or more subjects of the same verb, is marked by one of these cadences, or, where the number of syllables from the preceding pause is too small, by the latter part of a cadence. The practice which I have followed can be most readily made clear by quoting a portion of the text, and indicating and designating the clausulae where I find them. The selection is from Book I, Preface and Chapter I.

De suscepti operis consilio et argumento. (T3s$\gamma\delta$).

Gloriossimam ciuitatem Dei ([2aϵ) siue in hoc temporum cursu, (1aδ) cum inter inpios peregrinatur (A1a) ex fide uiuens, (1a$\beta\delta$) siue in illa stabilitate sedis aeternae, (1aγ) quam nunc expectat per patientiam, (D2aβ) quoadusque iustitia conuertatur in iudicium, (quotation) deinceps adeptura per excellentiam (D4s $\gamma\delta$) uictoria

ultima et pace perfecta, (1aγ) hoc opere ad te instituto (A3aγδ)
et mea [ad te] promissione debito ((6)θ) defendere aduersus eos,
(dubious 3) qui conditori eius deos suos praeferunt, ((4)iδζ) fili
carissime Marcelline, (3sδ) suscepi, (1γ)[8] magnum opus et ar-
duum, ((4)³δεζ) sed Deus adiutor noster est. (A3saγζ) Nam
scio quibus uiribus opus sit, ([2]³γε) ut persuadeatur superbis
([3ε) quanta sit uirtus humilitatis, (5s⁴aγδζ) qua fit ut omnia
terrena cacumina (D2γ) temporali mobilitate nutantia (2γ) non
humano usurpata fastu, (M3βζ) sed diuina gratia donata celsi-
tudo transcendat. (1γ) Rex enim et conditor ciuitatis huius,
(5aδθ) de qua loqui instituimus, ((3)⁴δ) in scriptura populi sui
([2]²γε) sententiam diuinae legis aperuit, (D1³aγ) qua dictum
est: *Deus superbis resistit, humilibus autem dat gratiam.* Hoc
uero, quod Dei est, superbae quoque animae spiritus inflatus ad-
fectat (1γ) amatque sibi in laudibus dici: (1aδ)

Parcere subiectis et debellare superbos.

Unde etiam de terrena ciuitate, ((5)sζ) quae cum dominari ad-
petit, (A2aδ) etsi populi seruiant, (A2aδ) ipsa ei dominandi libido
dominatur, (1²γ) non est practereundum silentio ((4)ε) quidquid
dicere suscepti huius operis ratio postulat (A4³aδζ) et facultas
datur. ([2aβε).

Chapter I.

De aduersariis nominis Christi, (1aδ) quibus in uastatione urbis
((5)θ) propter Christum barbari pepercerunt. (3iaδ).

Ex hac namque existunt inimici, (M1²γ) aduersus quos defen-
denda est Dei ciuitas, (2aβδ) quorum tamen multi correcto in-
pietatis errore (1γ) ciues in ea fiunt satis idonei; ((4)³δε) multi
uero in eam tantis exardescunt ignibus odiorum (D3paδ) tamque
manifestis beneficiis (M1²³γ) redemtoris eius ingrati sunt, (1aγ)
ut hodie contra eam linguas non mouerent, ((5)sδζη) nisi ferrum
hostile fugientes (1²γ) in sacratis eius locis ([2]γε) uitam, de qua
superbiunt, inuenirent. (3δ) An non etiam illi Romani (M1aγ)
Christi nomini infesti sunt, (1aγ) quibus propter Christum bar-
bari pepercerunt? (3iaδ) Testantur hoc martyrum loca (1iaδ) et

---

[8] A member too short to constitute a clausula borrows from the pre-
ceding; and apparently the same syllables may be the end of one claus-
ula and the beginning of another, as here; nor is this in any way un-
reasonable.

basilicae apostolorum, ((3)) quae in illa uastatione Urbis
(M5aγθ) ad se confugientes (D1a) suos alienosque receperunt.
((5)tiζ) Huc usque cruentus saeuiebat inimicus, (1²γ) ibi acci-
piebat limitem trucidatoris furor, ([2]ε) illo ducebantur a mise-
rantibus hostibus, (D2δ) quibus etiam extra ipsa loca pepercerant,
((6)⁴δζη) ne in eos incurrerent, ((4)sε) qui similem misericor-
diam non habebant. (3δε) Qui tamen etiam ipsi alibi truces
([2]²γε) adque hostili more saevientes ((5)δζ) posteaquam ad
loca illa ueniebant, (1²aγ) ubi fuerat interdictum (T3saδ) quod
alibi belli iure licuisset, (1²aγ) tota feriendi refrenabatur inmanitas
(2γ) et captiuandi cupiditas frangebatur. (A3sδ) Sic euaserunt
multi, ((5)ssδθ) qui nunc Christianis temporibus detrahunt
(A2δ) et mala, quae illa ciuitas pertulit, (2aδ) Christo inputant;
((4)sδζ) bona uero, quae in eos ut uiuerent ((4)sεζ) propter
Christi honorem facta sunt, ((7)stsδζηκ) non inputant Christo
nostro (3saδζ) sed fato suo, ([2]γε) cum potius deberent, (M1¹aγ)
si quid recte saperent, ((3)s⁴δζ) illa, quae ab hostibus aspera et
dura perpessi sunt, (1aγ) illi prouidentiae diuinae tribuere,
([3]⁴ε) quae solet corruptos hominum mores (A1aδ) bellis emen-
dare adque conterere (1³aγ) itemque uitam mortalium (M2aγ)
iustam adque laudabilem (2aγ) talibus adflictionibus exercere
(D3sδ) probatamque uel in meliora transferre (1γ) uel in his
adhuc terris (1aβδ) propter usus alios detinere: (A3aδ) illud uero,
quod eis uel ubicumque propter Christi nomen ((5)ssδθ) uel in
locis Christi nomini dicatissimis et amplissimis (4iδε) ac pro
largiore misericordia ((6)⁴ζ) ad capacitatem multitudinis electis
((7)ttiδι) praeter bellorum morem (M3saγζ) truculenti barbari
pepercerunt, (3iaδ) hoc tribuere temporibus Christianis, (A3δ)
hinc Deo agere gratias, (4³aβδζ) hinc ad eius nomen ueraciter
currere, (2δ) ut effugiant poenas ignis aeterni, (1aγ) quod nomen
multi eorum mendaciter usurparunt, (D3sδ) ut effugerent poenas
praesentis exitii. (1³γ) Nam quos uides petulanter et procaciter
((6)ζη) insultare seruis Christi, ((5)tsζθ) sunt in eis plurimi,
(A2aβδ) qui illum interitum clademque non euasissent, (3sγδ)
nisi seruos Christi se esse finxissent. (1aγ) Et nunc ingrata super-
bia ((4)ε) adque inpiissima insania (2γ) eius nomini resistunt
corde peruerso, (1aγ) ut sempiternis tenebris puniantur, (A3aδ)
ad quod nomen ore uel subdolo confugerunt, (3saδ) ut temporali
luce fruerentur. (1²aγ)⁹

⁹ In connection with the passage which I have quoted accident brought

This selection, which, though no better than any other that might have been chosen, gives irrefragable evidence of the existence, distribution and variety of the clausulae, might tempt one to conclude that the clausulae at the slight pauses are poor and those at the stronger pauses are good. But this is not so; some of the poorest forms are found occasionally at the end of sentences and even of chapters, and some of the slightest pauses are marked by the very best clausulae. The only specific preference of the lesser pauses that can be certainly predicated, is for forms 4, 6, (4) and (6).

It will be seen from the above selection what is meant by saying that we find the clausulae in a state of decay. The direction of their development is tending toward non-being. More and more possible combinations of syllables tend to be admitted as constituting some kind of a clausula; use gives greater legitimacy to the clausula that at first was very poor; finally there will be no combination that can be excluded; and then all distinction between causula and non-clausula will have disappeared.

---

to my notice a bit of evidence that is worth citing. When I had finished copying the passage I asked a friend, having a thorough knowledge of Latin, but unacquainted with the principles of the clausula, to read to me from the text while I followed in my manuscript. He read slowly, with pauses, in order that I might make corrections, if necessary. When he had read about half way through I began to realize that he was stopping most frequently at the clausulae. From that point I began to observe this matter. From that point to the end of the chapter he made a pause a every place where, in the manuscript which I held in my hands, I had a clausula marked, and at those places only.

CHAPTER II.

ANALYSIS OF THE CLAUSULAE.

For the purpose of detailed analysis I have taken four sets of word groups as follows: first, 2000 consecutive sentence endings, omitting quotations and possible quotations, corrupt readings, and sentences too short to be certain of giving a formal clausula, from Books I, II, X, XI, XII, XIII and XXI through Chapter 24; second, the last sentences of all the chapters, with the same omissions, amounting to 617; third, the terminations of the chapter titles, with omissions as above, amounting to 657; and lastly, 1000 minor cola, being, for the sake of distribution, the first 45 or 46 occurring in each of the 22 books.

Each group, except the titles, shows a small number, never so many as 1% of the whole, that by reason of the combination of monosyllables, uncertain quantities and uncertain cases of elision or hiatus, are quite unsusceptible of satisfactory metrical description. In addition there is a group of what I call dubious forms, which do not seem to fit into the general scheme, or are of types too rare in their occurrence to justify their recognition, or can be conformed to the recognized types only by the admission of metrical licences which are not found elsewhere and which they themselves are not numerous enough to establish. These amount to about 2%. They are most numerous in the cola, where they reach 3%.

The remaining 97% or 98% admit readily of analysis into certain well defined types or, in the case of forms that are not of themselves frequent, legitimate and natural variations of these types by resolution of one or more long syllables. The "goodness" or "badness" of a given type depends, of course, solely on the frequency of its occurrence. Every writer is his own sole criterion of what are to be regarded as his good clausulae. Elsewhere I give a list of the more important clausulae in the order of their excellence in the *De Civitate Dei*.[1] Here I classify them, for convenience, according to their metrical relation with one another, that is in accordance with their theoretical excellence, the exactness

---

[1] Cf. p. 25.

of their conformity to the ideal types. I do not recognize a clausula as belonging to a type unless it conforms in accent as well as in metre,[2] at least as regards its first and last accents. Some clausulae of Type 3 and of the higher types do not have the intermediate accents always on the right syllable, but where one accent is out of place its immediate neighbors on either side are in place, and so preserve the general flow of the *numerus*.

Class I. This comprises all the calusulae which are perfect examples of Types 1, 2 and 3, either with or without resolution. These amount to from 50% to 60% of the whole number of clausulae. The unresolved forms, except in the cola, amount to more than 40% of the whole.

Class II. Types 1, 2 and 3 with one irrational syllable. I admit as a base the molossus, the dactyl and the anapaest. In Type 3 the first foot of the cadence may be a spondee or a pyrrhic. I do not admit the iambus in the last foot of the cadence as belonging to a legitimate type. If it does occur it is too rarely to prove anything. In Type 2 there cannot, in the nature of things, be an irrational syllable in the cadence, unless possibly ⏑ ⏑ ≍ (*in eam*) which hardly occurs. Under Type 1 in this class I have included the form | ⏑́ ⏑ − | ⏑ ≍ (*spiritum datur*), merely for the sake of uniformity. Probably these clausulae are really cases of (4) or 4. To denote the clausulae belonging to this class I have added to the symbol the initial letter of the name of foot containing the irrational syllable. A capital letter preceding the figure indicates the base, and a small letter following it indicates the first foot of the cadence. Thus | ⏑́ − − | ⏑́ ≍ (*caeli caelorum*) is M1, | ⏑ ⏑ − | ⏑́ ⏑ ≍ (*dubitat dicere*) is A2, | ⏑́ ⏑ − | − − | ⏑́ ≍ (*modestiae Romanorum*) is 3s, | ⏑́ ⏑ − | ⏑ ≍ (*spiritum datur*) is 1i, and so on.

Class III. These are the cases of Type 3 which admit of still greater metrical variation. The base may be a cretic, a molossus, a dactyl, an anapaest or a tribrach,[3] and the first foot of the cadence may be any foot of two syllables. The existence of this class and the legitimacy of these types are beyond question; but it is to be noted that the poorer they are theoretically the less frequently

---

[2] This means that the word accent and the metrical ictus must coincide.

[3] The existence of the tribrach as a base is open to serious question. Cf. p. 46.

they occur in fact. They will be discussed in detail later.[4] Resolution is admitted both in the base and in the cadence, but it is rare. The symbols are formed on the principles described for the preceding class. Thus │⏑ ⏑ ⏑ │ ⏑ – │ ⏑ ≍ (*admittere uiderentur*) is D3i, and so on.

Class IV. There are two clear cases of clausulae which are partial, consisting of the latter parts, respectively, of two of the Ciceronian clausulae. I have designated them by the appropriate figure, enclosed in square brackets. The form ⏑ – ⏑ ≍ is [2], and ⏑ – ⏑ ⏑ ≍ is [3]. These forms admit of resolution, but not of irrational syllables.

Class V. Types 4, 5, 6 and 7 and even longer types seem certainly to occur. At least their cadences are to be recognized as legitimate Augustinian clausulae. I have included them with the cadence of 3, occurring without a base, in Class V. I do not distinguish higher types than 7, as to do so would take up endless space to very little purpose. But I have found perfect clausulae with very long cadences, and long cadences without a base, one of Type (15), *blandiente uoluptate uel dolore saeuiente,* and there may be others even longer. These cadences admit of resolution of any rationally long syllable. About half of them have bases, which may be of any trisyllabic form except the bacchic and the antibacchic. An iambus may be substituted for a trochee in any foot of the cadence except the first and the last, and a spondee for a trochee in any foot. The few cases where we seem to have such a cadence ending in an iambus I have classed as dubious. The symbols employed to denote the clausulae of this class are: (3), 4, (4), 5, (5), 6, (6), (7).

Class VI. Under this head I have grouped the "dubious" clausulae, that is to say, those endings which can be classed as very poor clausulae by the most generous extension of metrical licence, or may be regarded as more or less intentionally formless endings.[5]

Class VII. There is a small number of endings composed largely of monosyllables together with dissyllables where elision may or may not take place. They cannot be classified with enough reasonable certainty to make their classification of any value.

---

[4] Cf. p. 33.
[5] Cf. p. 9.

Table of clausulae according to their distribution into classes.

Class		Sentence endings.		Chapter endings.		Chapter titles.		Minor clausulae.	
I.	1.	712	35.60%	224	36.30%	280	42.62%	284	28.40%
	2.	222	11.10	62	10.05	71	10.81	79	7.90
	3.	112	5.60	48	7.78	43	6.54	53	5.30
		1046	52.30	334	54.13	394	59.97	416	41.60
II.	1.	154	7.70	46	7.46	31	4.72	88	8.80
	2.	62	3.10	14	2.27	6	.91	45	4.50
	3.	188	9.40	66	10.70	93	14.16	69	6.90
		404	20.20	126	20.42	130	19.79	202	20.20
III.	t.	30	1.50	10	1.62	17	2.59	6	.60
	s.	62	3.10	25	4.05	20	3.04	27	2.70
	i.	47	2.35	13	2.11	34	5.18	13	1.30
	p.	28	1.40	10	1.62	2	.30	13	1.30
		167	8.35	58	9.40	73	11.11	59	5.90
IV.	[2].	121	6.05	28	4.54	5	.76	63	6.30
	[3].	21	1.05	11	1.78	8	1.22	26	2.60
		142	7.10	39	6.32	13	1.98	89	8.90
V	3.	33	1.65	6	.97	4	.61	40	4.
	4.	54	2.70	13	2.11	11	1.67	72	7.20
	5.	71	3.55	19	3.08	15	2.28	55	5.50
	6.	17	.85	4	.65	6	.91	16	1.60
	7.	26	1.30	7	1.13	7	1.07	18	1.80
		201	10.05	49	7.94	43	6.54	201	20.10
VI.		27	1.35	9	1.46	4	.61	32	3.20
VII.		13	.65	2	.32	—	—	1	.10
		2000		617		657		1000	

The following table gives the complete analysis of the groups of clausulae examined according to the distribution of the long and short syllables and of the accents. I take no account here of the caesurae, since to do so would extend this table to fifteen pages and would serve no useful purpose. Under the discussion of the various types I give the proportions of the types according to

caesurae, wherever it is important enough to be worthy of notice. It will be seen that not all the possible resolutions are represented here. I have encountered some cases of resolutions which do not happen to occur in the groups here analyzed; and almost any reasonably possible combination of resolutions can probably be found somewhere in the *De Civitate Dei*. In fact the freedom with which resolution is admitted is one of the clearest evidences of the fundamentally metrical character of the clausulae.

Type	Symbol	Sentence endings.		Chapter endings.		Chapter titles.		Minor clausulae.	
		Class I. Type 1.							
`⏑ –	⏑ ≍`	1	541	27.05	166	26.90	169	25.72	193	19.30
`⏑⏑ ⏑ –	⏑ ≍`	1¹	8	.40	—	—	5	.76	23	2.30
`⏑ ⏑⏑⏑	⏑ ≍`	1²	70	3.50	22	3.56	33	5.02	25	2.50
`⏑ –	⏑⏑⏑ ≍`	1³	75	3.75	30	4.87	70	10.65	40	4.
`⏑⏑ ⏑⏑⏑	⏑ ≍`	1¹²	16	.80	6	.97	1	.15	2	.20
`⏑⏑ ⏑ –	⏑⏑ ≍`	1¹³	1	.05	—	—	—	—	1	.10
`⏑ ⏑⏑⏑	⏑⏑ ≍`	1²³	1	.05	—	—	2	.30	—	—
		Class I. Type 2.							
`⏑ –	⏑ ⏑ ≍`	2	211	10.55	59	9.56	68	10.35	75	7.50
`⏑⏑ ⏑ –	⏑ ⏑ ≍`	2¹	4	.20	—	—	—	—	3	.30
`⏑ ⏑⏑⏑	⏑ ⏑ ≍`	2²	4	.20	3	.49	3	.46	1	.10
`⏑ –	⏑⏑⏑ ⏑ ≍`	2³	1	.05	—	—	—	—	—	—
`⏑⏑⏑⏑	⏑ ⏑ ≍`	2¹²	2	.10	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Class I. Type 3.							
`⏑ –	– ⏑	⏑ ≍`	3	106	5.30	48	7.78	40	6.09	47	4.70
`⏑ ⏑⏑	– ⏑	⏑ ≍`	3²	—	—	—	—	1	.15	1	.10
`⏑ –	⏑⏑⏑	⏑ ≍`	3³	3	.15	—	—	2	.30	1	.10
`⏑ –	– ⏑	⏑⏑ ≍`	3⁴	1	.05	—	—	—	—	4	.40
`⏑ –	⏑⏑⏑	⏑⏑ ≍`	3³⁴	2	.10	—	—	—	—	—	—
		Class II. Type 1.							
`⏑ ⏑⏑	⏑ ≍`	D1	22	1.10	4	.65	10	1.52	20	2.
`⏑ ⏑⏑	⏑⏑ ≍`	D1³	18	.90	5	.81	3	.46	5	.50
`⏑ ⏑ –	⏑ ≍`	A1	38	1.90	12	1.94	4	.61	14	1.40
`⏑ ⏑⏑⏑	⏑ ≍`	A1²	2	.10	—	—	—	—	—	—
`⏑ ⏑ –	⏑⏑ ≍`	A1³	4	.20	1	.16	—	—	6	.60
`⏑ – –	⏑ ≍`	M1	21	1.05	6	.97	4	.61	13	1.30
`⏑⏑ – –	⏑ ≍`	M1¹	1	.05	1	.16	1	.15	2	.20
`⏑ – ⏑⏑	⏑ ≍`	M1²	6	.30	2	.32	1	.15	7	.70
`⏑ – –	⏑⏑ ≍`	M1³	7	.35	2	.32	—	—	5	.50
`⏑⏑ – –	⏑⏑ ≍`	M1¹³	—	—	—	—	1	.15	1	.10
`⏑ –	⏑ ≍`	1i	35	1.75	13	2.11	7	1.07	15	1.50

3

Type	Symbol	Sentence endings.		Chapter endings.		Chapter titles.		Minor clausulae.	
		CLASS II. TYPE 2.							
‒ ◡ ◡ | ‒ ◡ ≍	D2	25	1.25	11	1.78	2	.30	17	1.70
◡ ◡ ‒ | ‒ ◡ ≍	A2	25	1.25	2	.32	1	.15	17	1.70
‒ ‒ ‒ | ‒ ◡ ≍	M2	9	.45	1	.16	3	.46	8	.80
◡◡ ‒ ‒ | ‒ ◡ ≍	M2¹	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	.30
‒ ‒◡◡ | ‒ ◡ ≍	M2²	3	.15	—	—	—	—	—	—
		CLASS II. TYPE 3.							
‒ ◡ ‒ | ‒ ‒ ‒ ≍	3s	38	1.90	16	2.59	16	2.44	11	1.10
‒ ◡◡◡ | ‒ ‒ ‒ ≍	3²s	1	.05	—	—	—	—	2	.20
‒ ◡ ‒ | ‒ ‒ ◡◡≍	3⁴s	3	.15	—	—	—	—	1	.10
‒ ◡ ‒ | ◡ ◡ | ‒ ≍	3p	13	.65	1	.16	4	.61	3	.30
‒ ◡ ◡ | ◡ ◡ | ‒ ≍	D3	50	2.50	19	3.08	24	3.65	18	1.80
‒ ◡ ◡ | ◡◡◡ | ‒ ≍	D3³	1	.05	—	—	1	.15	—	—
◡ ◡ ‒ | ‒ ◡ | ‒ ≍	A3	63	3.15	25	4.05	45	6.85	29	2.90
‒ ‒ ‒ | ‒ ◡ | ‒ ≍	M3	17	.85	5	.81	3	.46	4	.40
‒ ‒◡◡ | ‒ ◡ | ‒ ≍	M3²	1	.05	—	—	—	—	1	.10
‒ ‒ ‒ | ‒ ◡ | ◡◡≍	M3⁴	1	.05	—	—	—	—	—	—
		CLASS III. TYPE 3t.							
◡ ◡ ◡ | ‒ ◡ | ‒ ≍	T3	30	1.50	10	1.62	17	2.59	6	.60
		CLASS III. TYPE 3s.							
‒ ◡ ◡ | ‒ ‒ | ‒ ≍	D3s	22	1.10	9	1.46	9	1.37	6	.60
◡ ◡ ‒ | ‒ ‒ | ‒ ≍	A3s	23	1.15	7	1.13	8	1.22	10	1.
◡ ◡ ◡ | ‒ ‒ | ‒ ≍	T3s	11	.55	8	1.30	3	.46	7	.70
‒ ‒ ‒ | ‒ ‒ | ‒ ≍	M3s	5	.25	1	.16	—	—	4	.40
◡◡ ‒ ‒ | ‒ ‒ | ‒ ≍	M3¹s	1	.05	—	—	—	—	—	—
		CLASS III. TYPE 3i.							
‒ ◡ ‒ | ◡ ‒ | ‒ ≍	3i	22	1.10	4	.65	18	2.74	7	.70
‒ ◡ ◡ | ◡ ‒ | ‒ ≍	D3i	7	.35	3	.49	3	.46	1	.10
◡ ◡ ‒ | ◡ ‒ | ‒ ≍	A3i	13	.65	4	.65	12	1.83	4	.40
◡ ◡ ◡ | ◡ ‒ | ‒ ≍	T3i	4	.20	2	.32	1	.15	1	.10
‒ ‒ ‒ | ◡ ‒ | ‒ ≍	M3i	1	.05	—	—	—	—	—	—
		CLASS III. TYPE 3p.							
‒ ◡ ◡ | ◡ ◡ | ‒ ≍	D3p	13	.65	8	1.30	1	.15	9	.90
◡ ◡ ‒ | ◡ ◡ | ‒ ≍	A3p	15	.75	2	.32	1	.15	4	.40
		CLASS IV. TYPE [2].							
‒ ◡ ‒ ‒ ◡ ≍	[2	36	1.80	12	1.94	3	.46	17	1.70
◡◡◡ ‒ ‒ ◡ ≍	[2¹	3	.15	—	—	—	—	1	.10
‒ ◡ ‒ ◡◡ ◡ ≍	[2²	3	.15	—	—	—	—	2	.20
‒ ◡ ‒ ◡◡ ◡ ≍	[2³	2	.10	—	—	—	—	2	.20

Type	Symbol	Sentence endings.		Chapter endings.		Chapter titles.		Minor clausulae.	
⏑⏑⌣‒ ⌣≍	[2¹²	1	.05	—	—	—	—	—	—
‒‒ ⌣≍	[2]	55	2.75	16	2.59	2	.30	34	3.40
⌣⌣‒ ⌣≍	[2]²	15	.75	—	—	—	—	6	.60
‒⏑⏑ ⌣≍	[2]³	6	.30	—	—	—	—	1	.10

CLASS IV. TYPE [3].

Type	Symbol								
‒⏑‒‒ ⏑‒≍	[3	5	.25	4	.65	3	.46	4	.40
⏑⏑‒‒ ⏑⌣⏑≍	[3¹⁴	1	.05	—	—	—	—	—	—
‒‒ ⏑‒≍	[3]	12	.60	5	.81	5	.76	13	1.30
⌣⌣‒ ⏑‒≍	[3]²	2	.10	—	—	—	—	3	.30
‒⏑⏑ ⏑‒≍	[3]³	1	.05	—	—	—	—	2	.20
‒‒ ⏑⌣⏑≍	[3]⁴	—	—	2	.32	—	—	4	.40

CLASS V. TYPE (3).

Type	Symbol								
|‒⏑|⌣≍	(3)	12	.60	2	.32	3	.46	15	1.50
|⌣≍|⌣≍	(3)n	21	1.05	4	.65	1	.15	25	2.50

CLASS V. TYPE 4.

Type	Symbol								
|⌣≍≍|‒⏑|⌣⏑≍	4	9	.45	1	.16	—	—	11	1.10
|⌣≍≍|‒‒|⌣⏑≍	4s	23	1.15	1	.16	2	.30	16	1.60
|⌣≍≍|⌣‒|⌣⏑≍	4i	5	.25	1	.16	4	.61	8	.80
|⌣≍≍|⌣⌣≍|⌣⏑≍	4n	2	.10	1	.16	—	—	6	.60
|‒⏑|⌣⏑≍	(4)	4	.20	1	.16	1	.15	9	.90
|‒‒|⌣⏑≍	(4)s	8	.40	4	.65	1	.15	14	1.40
|⌣≍|⌣⏑≍	(4)n	3	.15	4	.65	3	.46	8	.80

CLASS V. TYPE 5.

Type	Symbol								
|⌣≍≍|‒⏑|‒⏑|⌣≍	5	13	.65	2	.32	3	.46	12	1.20
|⌣≍≍|⌣⌣≍|⌣⌣≍|⌣≍	5n	12	.50	5	.81	4	.61	14	1.40
|‒⏑|‒⏑|⌣≍	(5)	12	.60	1	.16	1	.15	7	.70
|⌣≍|⌣⌣≍|⌣⌣≍	(5)n	34	1.70	11	1.76	7	1.07	22	2.20

CLASS V. TYPE 6.

Type	Symbol								
|⌣≍≍|‒⏑|‒⏑|⌣⏑≍	6	1	.05	—	—	1	.15	2	.20
|⌣≍≍|⌣⌣≍|⌣⌣≍|⌣⏑≍	6n	8	.40	2	.32	2	.30	2	.20
|‒⏑|‒⏑|⌣⏑≍	(6)	3	.15	1	.16	1	.15	3	.30
|⌣≍|⌣⌣≍|⌣⏑≍	(6)n	5	.25	1	.16	2	.30	9	.90

CLASS V. TYPE 7.

Type	Symbol								
|‒⏑|‒⏑|‒⏑|⌣≍	(7)	12	.60	3	.49	—	—	6	.60
|‒≍|≍≍|≍≍|⌣≍	(7)n	14	.70	4	.65	7	1.07	12	1.20

CLASSES VI AND VII.

		40	2.10	11	1.78	4	.61	33	3.30

A comparison of the third and fourth columns of the table given above will be very instructive, throwing much light on the distinction between the good and the poor clausulae. It will be noted that of the four groups the titles show the greatest preference for forms that conform closely to the fundamental types, and that the cola admit the largest licence. *A priori,* also, one would expect that of the four the titles would receive the most careful attention and the most disciplined treatment from the writer, and that in the cola he would allow himself the greatest measure of freedom. The titles almost exclude resolutions except in the case of the well known and familiar forms 1^2 (*maiora cohibentur*) and 1^3 (*caritate conplacuit*), which had been recognized for centuries as characteristic of careful writers. On the whole we may say that the titles are composed with a greater care for metrical propriety than is the text. But there is no evidence to show that the titles are composed in accordance with a different clausula system from that followed in the text. They are governed by a stricter application of the rule, not by the application of a stricter rule. From this we may draw two conclusions. First, there is no conclusive evidence to be got from the metrical treatment against the Augustinian authorship of the titles. If St. Augustine did not write them, they were written by someone who very closely followed his metrical style. However, the evidence for the autheticity is equally inconclusive; there are discrepancies that are difficult to explain.[6] Secondly, the preference of the types in the titles may be taken as evidence of the superior excellence of those types. After the titles, the chapter endings receive the most careful treatment, and after them, with but little difference, the other sentence endings, while the cola are treated with the least care. Therefore we may conclude with fair assurance of correctness that those forms which show a higher percentage in Column 4 than in the other three are poor, and conversely that those showing their lowest percentage in the cola and their highest in the titles are good. For example, the Ciceronian *esse videatur* terminates 5 per cent. of the chapter titles, $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the chapters, $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the sentences, and $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the cola. However, this principle of preference cannot safely be carried to a final detailed conclusion as to the precise position of each of the minor types, since the number of

---

[6] Cf. Table of Preferences, p. 25. Note especially, [2] and 1^3.

chapters is not sufficient for this purpose. We can, on this basis, establish the relative merits among the more important clausulae with certainty, and among those of fairly frequent occurrence with probability; but among the rarer forms it means nothing whatever. It must further be borne in mind that we are dealing here with two facts which are in their nature absolutely distinct, but in the evidence by which we can judge them, inextricably confused. These are St. Augustine's conception of the rules which govern the clausulae, and the unconscious or only partly conscious psychoogical tendency which governed his practice. He does not regard Type [2] (*talem uiam*) as a good clausula to be held in high repute by rhetoricians; but he finds it very comfortable and suitable form with which to take leave of a great many of his sentences. And conversely, 1^3 (*caritate conplacuit*) is ranked higher by his judgment than by his taste. But even this is hardly more than conjecture, and this is as far as even conjecture can go.

The following table gives the clausulae in the order of their preference. It is carried as far as the statistics presented can be said to give any really trustworthy assurance.

TABLE OF PREFERENCES.

	Sentence endings.		Chapter endings.		Chapter titles.		Minor clausulae.	
1.	1	27.05%	1	26.90%	1	25.72%	1	19.30%
2.	2*	10.55%	2*	9.56%	1^3	10.65%	2	7.50%
3.	3*	5.30%	3*	7.78%	2*	10.35%	[2]***	5.10%
4.	[2]***	4.70%	1^3	4.87%	A3	6.85%	3	4.70%
5.	1^3	3.75%	[2]***	4.53%	3*	6.09%	1^3	4.00%
6.	1^2	3.50%	A3	4.05%	1^2	5.02%	(4)s**	3.00%
7.	A3	3.15%	1^2	3.51%	D3	3.65%	A3	2.90%
8.	D3	2.50%	D3	3.08%	3i	2.74%	1^2	2.50%
9.	3s	1.90%	3s	2.59%	T3	2.59%	1^1	2.30%
10.	A1	1.90%	1i	2.11%	3s	2.44%	(5)**	2.10%
11.	1i	1.75%	A1	1.94%	A3i	1.83%	D1	2.00%
12.	(4)s**	1.55%	D2	1.78%	D1	1.58%	(4)**	2.00%
13.	T3	1.50%	T3	1.62%	D3s	1.37%	D3	1.80%
14.	D2	1.25%	D3s	1.46%	A3s	1.22%	D2	1.70%
15.	A2	1.25%	[3]****	1.46%	[3]****	1.22%	A2	1.70%
16.	(5)**	1.25%	T3s	1.30%	1i	1.07%	[3]****	1.70%
17.	A3s	1.15%	D3p	1.30%	(4)i**	1.07%	1i	1.50%
18.	3i	1.10%	A3s	1.13%	[2]***	.76%	(3)	1.50%
19.	D1	1.10%	M1	.97%	1^1	.76%	A1	1.40%
20.	D3s	1.10%	1^{12}	.97%	A1	.61%	M1	1.30%

	Sentence endings.		Chapter endings.		Chapter titles.		Minor clausulae.
21.	M1	1.05%	(4)s**	.81%	M1	.61%	
22.			D1³	.81%	(5)**	.61%	
23.			(4)i**	.81%	3p	.61%	

* Note however that all the varieties of 3 taken together amount to about twice as many as all the varieties of 2 taken together.

** Including the forms both with and without the base.

*** Including [2.   **** Including [3.

This table may be supplemented by adding to each column those forms missing from it which are found in one of the others, as follows:

	Sentence endings.		Chapter endings.		Chapter titles.		Minor clausulae.	
21.							(4)i**	1.50%
22.	D1³	.90%					3s	1.10%
23.	[3]	.85%					A3s	1.00%
24.	1¹²	.80%	3i	.65%	D1³	.46%	D3p	.90%
25.	A3i	.65%	D1	.65%	(4)s**	.46%	3i	.70%
26.	3p	.65%	A3i	.65%	T3s	.46%	T3s	.70%
27.	D3p	.65%	(5)**	.49%	(3)	.46%	D3s	.60%
28.	(4)**	.65%	A2	.32%	D2	.30%	T3	.60%
29.	(3)	.60%	(4)**	.32%	1¹²	.15%	D1³	.50%
30.	T3s	.55%	(3)	.32%	D3p	.15%	A3i	.40%
31.	1¹	.40%	3p	.16%	A2	.15%	3p	.30%
32.	(4i)**	.30%	1¹	.00%	(4)**	.15%	1¹²	.20%

One striking fact which will appear from the examination of the above table is the comparative rarity of the forms with the molossus base. Types 1, 2 and 3 appear here with about the same frequency as in Cicero; whereas the forms M2 and M3 occur only about one-tenth as often as in Cicero.[7] This is partially explained by the fact that they are possible only with the β and γ caesurae, which in Type 3 are comparatively rare. For the first syllable of the base must bear the accent or must be a monosyllable. It is the operation of the same law which accounts for the disappearance of the extended bases, choriambus and epitrite, in late writers. I find very little reason to believe that these are known to St. Augustine.[8] While in Cicero the coincidence of the ictus and accent is desirable,

[7] Cf. Zielinski's table. In Cicero M2 and M3 (i. e. 2 and 3) amount to 15.9%, in Augustine to about 1.2%.

[8] It would be possible for example to describe (6) tsη (*omnium clarissima*) as 2ᵗʳ, but not reasonable; and such forms are rare. St. Augustine however mentions the epitrite as one of the feet proper to prose. Cf. De Musica VI, 10, 26.

in late writers it is necessary. Tetrasyllabic bases occur, but only those made possible by resolution, where the metrical lightness of the syllables makes their flow from a single accent possible. The clausula is governed by rhythmical laws of equal importance with the metrical. Further, rhythm is in the clausula an element of the first importance. The clausulae are related among themselves rhythmically as well as metrically. And an otherwise poor form gains respectability by its rhythmical similarity to a good form. Thus –́ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑́ ≍ (*inmutabile bonum*) which is a resolution of –́ – ⏑́ ≍ (*uoluntas bona*) would be less frequent in its occurrence if it did not borrow a propriety from its rhythmical likeness to | –́ ⏑ – | –́ ≍ (*mendaciter scripta*). The importance of these rhythmical correspondences accounts for the development of many forms. This will be discussed under the heading of the various forms. But first it will be useful to give a table of the clausulae according to their rhythmical relation. This table could be extended almost endlessly, and quite uselessly. It is limited to five groups which have some importance.

RHYTHMICAL COUNTERPARTS OF TYPE 1.

1.	| –́ ⏑ – | –́ ≍	1	corporis sensus.
2.	| ⏑́ ⏑ – | –́ ≍	A1	hominum gentes.
3.	| –́ ⏑ – | ⏑́ ≍	1i	corporis sui.
4.	| –́ ⏑ ⏑ | –́ ≍	D1	uelle reuerti.
5.	| ⏑⏑ – ⏑́ ≍	[2][2]	homines Dei.
6.	| –́ ⏑⏑ –́ ≍	[2][3]	nomina mala.
7.	| –́ – ⏑ –́ ≍	[3]	nondum uidetur.
8.	|⏑⏑| –́ ≍	(3)[3]	magis amatur.

RHYTHMICAL COUNTERPARTS OF TYPE 2.

1.	| –́ ⏑ – | –́ ⏑ ≍	2	esse contrarium.
2.	| –́ ⏑ – | ⏑⏑ ≍	1[3]	esse supplicium.
3.	| –́ ⏑ ⏑ | –́ ⏑ ≍	D²	mortis originem.
4.	| ⏑́ ⏑ – | –́ ⏑ ≍	A²	Deus adiuuerit.
5.	| –́ ⏑ ⏑ | ⏑⏑ ≍	D1[3]	nosse potuimus.
6.	| –́ – – | –́ ⏑ ≍	M2	nondum peruenerat.
7.	| –́ – – | ⏑⏑ ≍	M1[3]	uirtus et uitium.
8.	| ⏑́ ⏑ – | ⏑⏑ ≍	A1[3]	erit et misera.
9.	| ⏑⏑ | ⏑⏑ ≍	(3)[34]	utique nocuit.
10.	| ⏑⏑ | –́ ⏑ ≍	(4)[3]	alia quaestio est.
11.	| –́ – ⏑⏑ ≍	[3][4]	(adminicu)-lari memoriam.

28

Rhythmical Counterparts of Type 3.

1.	$\mid \acute{\smile}\smile-\mid-\smile\mid\acute{\smile}\asymp$	3	mortui nuncupantur.
2.		A3	requiem sempiternam.
3.		D3	noxia sentiantur.
4.		3s	ciuium Romanorum.
5.		T3	anima liberatur.
6.		A3s	animas defunctorum.
7.		D3s	cetera confidamus.
8.		3i	conscius uoluntatis.
9.		M3	uerbis offenderetur.
10.		1^{12}	facile superauit.
11.		A3p	meritum sequeretur.
12.		D3p	reddere rationem.
13.		A3i	etiam repugnaret.
14.		3p	septimo requieuit.
15.		T3s	uetere praecepisset.
16.		D3i	sumere putabatis.
17.		M3s	multum commendaretur.
18.		T3i	(in)-ferior an aequalis.
19.		M3i	ipsi non recesserunt.
20.		2^3	(be)-ata sit nisi Deus.
21.	(of (3)ζ)	[2]	numquam fuit.

Rhythmical Counterparts of Type 1^2.

1.		1^2	esse fateatur.
2.		1^1	generis humani.
3.		$M1^2$	reddi potuerunt.
4.		$A1^2$	nisi moriantur.
5.		$[3]^2$	etiam facultas.
6.		$M1^1$	minui consueuit.
7.		$[3]^3$	(ra)-dicitus inhaeret.
8.		(5)ζ	ipse curiosos.
		(5)η	ceteros ignorat.

Rhythmical Counterparts of Type 1^{13}.

1.		1^{13}	anima desipiat.
2.		1^{23}	uelle sacrificium.
3.		2^1	alitur ac figitur.
4.		2^2	esse cruciatibus.
5.		$M1^{13}$	(prin)-cipium sit reditum.

6. $|\smile\smile - -|\measuredangle\smile\asymp$ M2[1]   Veneris lasciuia.

7. $|\measuredangle - \smile\smile|\measuredangle\smile\asymp$ M2[2]   simplex quia trinitas.

8. $|\measuredangle\asymp|-\asymp|\smile\smile\asymp$ (5)[5]θ uniuerso populo.

The rhythmical comparison of the longer forms would run into a great deal of space, and as none of them are common, would not be of any considerable value. It is to be noted that the unresolved forms of (7) (*resurrectione mortuorum*), (*altitudo ruinosa*), are rhythmically independent.

This concludes the analysis of the clausulae except for the caesurae. They will be considered most conveniently under the separate discussion of the individual types in the following chapter.

While the 4274 clausulae analyzed are but a small portion of the probable total of something like 70,000 or 80,000, it will be seen from their distribution that they can be fairly taken as representative, and from the small proportion of doubtful or unanalyzable forms that this analysis comes near enough to being exhaustive. It can be safely claimed that the error is nowhere greater than $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent.; and that is as great a degree of accuracy as is valuable in an examination of this nature.

The Individual Clausulae.

Type 1.

1. $|\, \acute{}\, \smile - |\, \acute{}\, \asymp\;$ 27.05%[1]

The preferred caesura is, as is the case in all writers, the γ, *legemque mutauit, esse censeret*; but almost every possible caesura is represented, δ naturally coming in the second place. Examples with the percentage of frequency are:

α	confitebatur, I 10	.30%
αβ	in potestate, X 5	.05%
γ	simulante conponunt, XIII 24	12.75%
αγ	ignis effecit, XX 4	6.80%
		19.55%
δ	occiderant Christum, XIII 7	.70%
αδ	angelos fecit, XXI 6	1.65%
		2.35%
βγ	soler(e) et augeri, II 18	.10%
αβγ	si quis auderet, II 12	.15%
		.25%
αβδ	non erat mundus, XII 16	.40%
γδ	ueniatur in mortem, XIII 10	2.15%
αγδ	esse sub sole, XII 14	1.95%
		4.10%
αγδε	esse; sed non sunt, XXI 8	.05%

1[1]. $|\, \smile\smile - |\, \acute{}\, \asymp\;$ .40%

γ ariete percussi, X 17.

---

[1] The percentages here are taken from the sentence endings. Where a form which does not occur in the sentence endings is cited, to indicate this, it is enclosed in parentheses.

1^2. $|\stackrel{\perp}{} \smile \smile\smile|\stackrel{\perp}{} \asymp$ 3.50%

This is the second in importance of the forms containing resolution.   Ninety-five per cent. of the cases have the γ caesura.

    γ fecisse uideatur. XI, 9.
    $a\gamma$ esse fateatur. XIII 17, et passim.

This is, of course, the *esse uideatur* of Cicero, which has received so much notice.   It will be seen that the percentage is lower than in Cicero, (4.3%),[2] though about the same as in most late writers; in the titles (5.02%) it is higher than in Cicero.   Contamination with this form has probably tended to increase the number of (5) forms, as *esse confitetur* ($|\stackrel{\perp}{} \smile|-\smile|\stackrel{\perp}{} \asymp$), *ista timerentur* ($|\stackrel{\perp}{} \smile|\smile-|\stackrel{\perp}{} \asymp$).[3]

1^3. $|\stackrel{\perp}{} \smile -|\smile\smile \asymp$ 3.75%

This is the commonest of all the forms with resolution, in each of the four groups.   Its remarkably high frequency of 10.65% in the titles is especially to be noted, as constituting the strongest argument from the metre against their Augustinian authorship.   Its rhythmical identity with 2 has probably contributed to increase its frequency; *esse contrarium,* 2, and *esse supplicium,* 1^3 are both good endings and do not greatly differ.   The γ caesura is the commonest.

$a\beta$	non abhorruimus, XI 33................	.05%
γ	tremendumque iudicium, XXI 16........	1.30%
$a\gamma$	esse supplicium, XXI 23...............	.90%
		2.20%
δ	apostolus loquitur, XIII 23.............	.15%
$a\delta$	singulis loquimur, XIII 24.............	.15%
		.30%
$\gamma\delta$	demonstrare non potuit, I 19...........	.50%
$a\gamma\delta$	unde nunc agimus, XXI 5..............	.50%
		1.00%

and some others.

[2] Zielinski's table.
[3] Cf. p. 46.

1^{12}. |⏑⏑⏑|⏑⏓   .80%

   γ   intellegere ualeamus, XI 7.
   αγ numerus animarum, XII 21.

No other caesura occurs. This form could with equal exactness be described as T3p. And in this connection it is worth noticing that the 3p forms always have the δ caesura, and, with the rarest exceptions, no others in addition. I have put this form here instead of classifying it as T3p for the sake of following Zielinski as closely as possible. The truth is that in this form two types of very different origin, the metrically exact and primitive though rare 1^{12} and the debased and derived T3p, fall together.

1^{13}. |⏑⏑ – |⏑⏑⏓   .05%

   αγ anima desipiat, XI 10.

1^{23}. |⏑ ⏑⏑⏑|⏑⏑⏓   .05%

   αγ uelle sacrificium, X 5.

Type 2.

2. |⏑ ⏑ – |⏑ ⏑ ⏓   10.55%

There is a great variety of caesura, γ, δ and γδ are all very frequent.

αβ	non necessarium, X 1..................	.05%
γ	perfecta consumtio, XII 10............	3.45%
αγ	esse contraria, XXI 5.................	2.10%
		5.55%
δ	triennio uiuere, XXI 5...............	.75%
αδ	possumus credere, XXI, 5.............	1.05%
		1.80%
βγ	laetar(i) in amentia,[4] XI 27............	.05%
αβγ	ips(e) et oblatio, X 20...............	.05%
		.10%

[4] For the elision, see the next chapter.

αβδ   non habet temporis, XII 14............   .35%
γδ   oportere non credere, XXI 6........... 1.15%
αγδ   esse rem publicam, II 20............. 1.25%
                                           2.40%

αγε   (quando aetern(a) erit), XIV 25 end.
αδε   debitus non potest, X 1................   .10%
αβδε   et mori non potest, XXI 3.............   .15%
αγδε esse quae non erat, X 31..............   .05%

2^1. |⏖ ⏑ – |� ⏑ ⏓   .20%

αγ liceat occidere, I 20.

2^2. |⏑ ⏑ ⏖|⏑ ⏑ ⏓   .20%

All the examples which I have found have the γ caesura.

αγ esse capitolium, II 24.

2^3. |⏑ ⏑ – |⏖ ⏑ ⏓   .05%

γδε beata sit nisi Deus, XII 1.

2^{12}. |⏖ ⏖|⏑ ⏑ ⏓ .10%

αγ anima sapientiam, XI 10.

Type 3.

3. |⏑ ⏑ – |– ⏑ |⏑ ⏓   5.30%

It will be noticed that Type 3 is much less frequent than in Cicero, (10%).[5] Yet it is the strongest and most striking of all the clausulae. I believe that the explanation is to be found in the fact that the real form of Type 3 to be recognized in late writers has, indifferently, a cretic, a dactyl or an anapaest for its base, and a trochee, a spondee or an iambus for the first foot of its cadence. This is the form as it has been recognized generally by investigators of the clausula in late writers; and I think they are right. The cretic is the favourite base, and the trochee the favourite first foot of the cadence; but that is as much as can be said for them. I have classified as I have done in the interest of theoretical consistency and uniformity, inorder to adhere as closely as possible to Zielinski's system. I have put the pure form of Type 3 by itself in the same class with the pure forms of Types 1 and 2, and the

---

[5] Zielinski's table.

variants of 3 with the corresponding variants of 1 and 2. To do so is a convenient arrangement. To leave it at that is misleading. The relation between 2 and D2 is by no means the same as the relation between 3 and D3. D2 is a second-rate form, while D3 is one of the best forms, half as frequent as 3 itself. I believe that a truer description would be to class the varieties enumerated above as constituting the good forms of Type 3, a type which suffers internal division as to the preference of the various subtypes, and to make the second or poorer class consist of those forms with molossus or tribrach base (if the latter be admitted at all)[6] and those with a pyrrhic in the first foot of the cadence. Thus we have Type

3.
$$\left.\begin{array}{l} |\, \acute{\smile}\, \smile\, - | \\ |\, \acute{\smile}\, \smile\, \smile | \\ |\, \smile\, \smile\, - | \end{array}\right\} \left\{\begin{array}{l} |- \smile| \\ |- -| \\ |\smile -| \end{array}\right\} \quad |\, \acute{\smile}\, \asymp \quad 17.20\%$$

The preference of the various divergent elements is as follows:

$$|\, \acute{\smile}\, \smile\, - | \quad \left\{\begin{array}{l} |- \smile| \\ |- -| \\ |\smile -| \end{array}\right\} \quad |\, \acute{\smile}\, \asymp \quad 8.30\%$$

$$|\, \acute{\smile}\, \smile\, \smile | \quad \left\{\begin{array}{l} |- \smile| \\ |- -| \\ |\smile -| \end{array}\right\} \quad |\, \acute{\smile}\, \asymp \quad 3.95\%$$

$$|\, \smile\, \smile\, - | \quad \left\{\begin{array}{l} |- \smile| \\ |- -| \\ |\smile -| \end{array}\right\} \quad |\, \acute{\smile}\, \asymp \quad 4.95\%$$

$$\overline{\qquad\qquad 17.20\%}$$

and:

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} |\, \acute{\smile}\, \smile\, - | \\ |\, \acute{\smile}\, \smile\, \smile | \\ |\, \smile\, \smile\, - | \end{array}\right\} \quad |- \smile |\, \acute{\smile}\, \asymp \quad 10.95\%$$

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} |\, \acute{\smile}\, \smile\, - | \\ |\, \acute{\smile}\, \smile\, \smile | \\ |\, \smile\, \smile\, - | \end{array}\right\} \quad |- -|\, \acute{\smile}\, \asymp \quad 4.15\%$$

[5] Cf. p. 46.

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} |\;\acute{}\;\smile\;-\;| \\ |\;\acute{}\;\smile\;\smile\;| \\ |\;\acute{}\;\smile\;-\;| \end{array}\right\} \quad |\;\smile\;-\;|\;\acute{}\;\asymp \quad 2.10\%$$

$$17.20\%$$

In the pure form of Type 3 ($|\;\acute{}\;\smile\;-\;|\;-\;\smile\;|\;\acute{}\;\asymp$ 5.30%) I find twelve varieties of caesura, δ, γδ and δε are of frequent occurrence.

γ	prudenter intellegantur, X 12..........	.25%
αγ	semper existimemus, II 1..............	.05%
		.30%
δ	diutius permaneret, XXI 6............	1.50%
αδ	litteris inuenitur, XII 13..............	1.70%
		3.20%
αβδ	(non ferens interemit). I 23 Tit.	
αβε	non creatus creatum, XIII 24..........	.05%
γδ	significata sunt crederentur, X 5........	.25%
αγδ	mundus est, occupatam, XI 5..........	.30%
		.55%
αγε	semper illi fuerunt, XII 16............	.10%
γζ	natura, doctrina, usus,[7] XI 25........	.05%
δε	mutabilem non haberet, XII 21........	.30%
αδε	gaudium non haberent, XXI 17........	.50%
		.80%
δζ	intellegunt siue credunt, XI 33........	.05%
αδζ	(forsitan propter ipsum) II 15 end.	
		.05%
αβδε	non erat se uidere, X 13..............	.05%
γδε	eramus et non eramus, X 24...........	.10%
αγδε	causa est sed dolendi,[7] XIII 2..........	.05%
		.15%

αγδζ (ista est, ergo nulla est.)[7] 1 27 end.

[7] For the hiatus and the quantity see the following chapter.

3². | ∠ ∪ ∪ | – ∪ | ∠ ⋍

      (De theologis poetis.)   XVIII 14 Tit.

3³. | ∠ ∪ – | ∪∪ ∪ | ∠ ⋍   .15%

     δ scientiae resiluisses, X 28.

3⁴. | ∠ ∪ – | – ∪ | ∪ ⋍   .05%

     αβζ ill(i) adhaerere uitium est, XII 1.

3³⁴. | ∠ ∪ – | ∪∪ ∪ | ∪ ⋍   .10%

     ζ incomprehensibilis homini, X 12.

Type I with one irrational syllable.

D1. | ∠ ∪ ∪ | ∠ ⋍   1.10%

The most frequently occurring caesura is simply α.

    α   commemoraui, I 10.
    αδ sanguine uinci, XXI 4.

D1³. | ∠ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ⋍   .90%

This form could be described as D2A, and perhaps has as much relation to 2 as to 1. I find five types of caesura, of which γ occurs most frequently.

    γ   partitione minuitur, X 3.
    αδ   deserit anima, XIII 2.
    αβδ ut bene faciant, X 10.

A1. | ∪ ∪ – | ∠ ⋍   1.90%

Seven varieties of caesura occur, the commonest is δ.

    α   superaturam, XXI 18.
    αγ homo peccasset, XIII 24.
    δ   intellegerent pauci, X 15.

A1². | ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∠ ⋍   .10%

    αγ nisi moriuntur, XIII 4.

A1³. | ∪ ∪ – | ∪ ⋍   .20%

Like D1³ this form may be related to 2 rather than to 1.

    δ interitu doleant, XXI 4.

M1. | ∠ – – | ∠ ⋍   1.05%

Seven types of caesura are found.

αβ   non usurpamus, I 26.
αγδε qualis nunc non est, XXI 3.
αγ   ipsis debemus, X 3.

M1¹. |⌣– –|⊥ ≍   .05% [8]
αγ minui consueuit, XII 3.

M1². |⊥ –⌣|⊥ ≍   .30%
γ appellari morientes, XIII 11.

M1³. |⊥ – –|⌣≍   .35%
αγδ uirtus et uitium, I 8.

M1¹³. |⌣– –|⌣≍
γδ (principium sit reditum.)   XV 21 tit.

1i. |⊥ ⌣ –|⌣ ≍   1.75%

The δ caesura is essential to this type.   Those with the γδ are classed here though perhaps they should be classed as (4).   I view this type with a certain amount of suspicion.   Perhaps it is only a variant of (4), with a misplaced accent.   I have put it here for the sake of uniformity.

δ   Platonici uolunt, XIII 17.
γδ permanere cum Deo.   X 29.

Type 2 with one irrational syllable.

D2. |⊥ ⌣ ⌣|⊥ ⌣ ≍   1.25%

No cases of resolution occur in the groups that I have examined. The principal caesura is γ or δ.

α   commemorauimus, XXI 8.
αγ quisque potentior, II 20.
δ   corporalibus ignibus, XXI 10.

---

[8] The existence of these resolutions of the heavy base seems somewhat surprising, especially when they occur in such small numbers.   But their existence is undeniable, and they do not admit of another classification. They constitute a very definite evidence for the fundamentally metrical character of the clausulae.

4

A2. $|\smile\smile-|\perp\smile\asymp$ 1.25%

I find no cases with resolution. The principal caesura is δ; γ is rare.

    αγ Deus adiuuerit, XII 28.
    δ   uisceribus beluae, I 14.

M2. $|\perp--|\perp\smile\asymp$ .45%

    αγ nondum peruenerat, X 32.
    αγδ propter quid fecerit, XI 24.

M2¹. $|\smile--|\perp\smile\asymp$

    αγ (Veneris lasciuia) VII 26.

M2². $|\perp-\smile\smile|\perp\smile\asymp$ .15%

    αγ re uera Capitolium, II 24.
    αγδ simplex quia trinitas, XI 10.

Type 3 with one irrational syllable.

3s. $|\perp\smile-|--|\perp\asymp$ 1.90%

This form appears in Cicero only for the purpose of giving great solemnity to the sentence. No such distinction is found here, nor indeed after Cicero generally. Nine varieties of caesura occur. The commonest is δ.

    δ   inoboedientiā peccabatur, XIII 20.
    αγδε possit a quo purgentur, X 10.
    αδζ ciuitas regis Christi, I 35.

3²s. $|\perp\smile\smile\smile|--|\perp\asymp$ .05%

    αγεζ ipse, simulant, sed plane sunt, X 11.

3⁴s. $|\perp\smile-|--|\smile\smile\asymp$ .15%

    αδε audiant ad iudicium, II 28.

3p. $|\perp\smile-|\smile\smile|\perp\asymp$ .65%

All of the forms having the pyrrhic second foot, that is 3p, A3p and D3p (M3p does not occur), taken together amount to 2.05%, or including T3p (classified as 1¹²), to 2.85%. This percentage is as high as for the forms where this foot is an iambus. The latter, having two syllables with altered quantity, is classed as if it were a poorer form than that with the pyrrhic, which has only

one irrational syllable, whereas it is really theoretically better since at least the iambic foot is of the same metrical weight as the trochaic. The pyrrhic is difficult to explain, especially as the short syllable used for a long is not accented (at least not with a primary accent). I believe that this form has been developed by contamination with the correct forms of Types 3 and 5. This question is discussed at the end of the chapter. The only caesura is δ.

    δ   dignissimos habuerunt, I 3.
    δ   dormientibus uigilarent, II 22.
    αδ liberum uiolaret, I 6.
    αδ litterā geminatā, XIII 11.

D3. | ∠ ⏑ ⏑ | – ⏑ | ∠ ≍   2.50%

I find ten varieties of caesura. Nine-tenths of the cases have the δ caesura; seven-tenths have it only.

    ·δ   cumulatius augeantur, XIII 7.
    αδ ordinis adpetitus, XI 28.
    δε remittitur in futuro, XXI 24.
    αγζ huius amore fecit, I 24.

D3³. | ∠ ⏑ ⏑ | ⏑⏑⏑ | ∠ ≍   .05%
    αδε corpora, quia dolebunt, XXI 3.

A3. | ⏑ ⏑ – | – ⏑ | ∠ ≍   3.15%

About 80% have the δ caesura.

    δ   corporibus separati, XIII 11.
    αδ ualeat sustineri, XXI 3.
    αδε capitis non peribit, I 12.
    γδ difficil(e) est inuenire, XXI 6.

M3. | ∠ – – | – ⏑ | ∠ ≍   .85%

There are eight varieties of caesura; all include the γ.

    γ   conciliarent auctoritatem, II 19.
    γδ interpretati sunt seruitutem, X 1.
    αβγζ haec est natura eius,[9] XXI 7.

M3². | ∠ – ⏒ | – ⏑ | – ≍   .05%
    γδ quaeratur nihil inuenitur, XII 6.

M3[4].　| ⏑ − − | − ⏑ | ⏑⏑ ⤫　.05%

　　γ　prophetā incredibilius est,[9] I 14.

<div align="center">Type 3 other variants.</div>

T3.　| ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | − ⏑ | ⏑ ⤫　1.50%

The use of the tribrach as a base is not certain. See the discussion at the end of the chapter. All the cases have the δ caesura; rarely it is accompanied by others.

　　δ　corporibus auferetur, XIII 22.
　　αδ　aliquid audeamus, XII 20.
　　δε　eligite quem colatis, I 32.

D3s.　| ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | − − | ⏑ ⤫　1.10%

The δ caesura occurs in every case; in a few ε also.

　　αδ　numina paganorum, XXI 6.
　　αδε　corpora non credamus, XIII 18.

A3s.　| ⏑ ⏑ − | − − | ⏑ ⤫　1.15%

I have found one case without the δ caesura.

　　αγζ　Deus adiutor noster est,[10] I praefatio.
　　δ　　cupiditas frangebatur, I 1.
　　αδε　penitus non accedant, X 28.

T3s.　| ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ | − − | ⏑ ⤫　.55%

All cases have the δ caesura; a few have others as well.

　　δ　　habuerit inprouisas, XII 21.
　　αδ　uetere praecepisset, X 5.

M3s.　| ⏑ − − | − − | ⏑ ⤫　.25%

All cases have the γ caesura; generally together with others.

　　αγ　multum commendaretur, X 20.
　　γδ　dicturi sunt infinitas, XII 21.

M3[1]s.　| ⏑⏑ − − | − − | ⏑ ⤫　.05%

　　γζ　sacrificium contriti cordis, X 5.

<hr>

[9] For the hiatus and *est*, see the following chapter.
[10] For *est* see the following chapter.

3i. $|\text{⏑} \lor - | \lor - | \text{⏑} \asymp$ 1.10%

The cadence of this type has an interesting history, and illustrates the kind of development to which the clausulae have been subject. It first appears as forming part of Type 1 with the β caesura. In writers employing a purely metrical clausula this form appears as $| - // \lor - | - \asymp$. Thus it became familiar as an accepted type of ending. As the growth in importance of the accent progressed this tetrasyllabic final [11] became more and more like $- \lor \text{⏑} \asymp$, and begin to appear like it after a trisyllabic base. So that $(\text{⏑} \lor) \_ \lor \_ \text{⏑} \asymp$ became instead of 1β a variant of 3δ.[12] This development accounts for the fact that all of the 3i clausulae have the δ caesura. But the final retains its preference for a preceding long syllable as a relic of its history. The cretic, anapaest and molossus together make up 76% of its bases, the dactyl and tribrach only 24%, whereas the proportion for $- \lor \text{⏑} \asymp$ and $- - \text{⏑} \asymp$ is somewhat lower, about 68% to 32%. And in the cases of (5) and (7) into which $\lor - \text{⏑} \asymp$ enters it is preceded by a spondee oftener than by a trochee, while the reverse is true for $- \lor \text{⏑} \asymp$ and $- - \text{⏑} \asymp$.

All cases have the δ caesura. Almost all have it only.

> δ adnuntiant uoluntatem, X 26.
> $a\delta$ barbari pepercerunt, I 1.
> $a\gamma\delta\epsilon$ noster est et illorum, X 3.

3i⁴. $|\text{⏑} \lor - | \lor - | \text{⏑}\text{⏑} \asymp$

>   (uoluntariae necis tribuat.)

D3i. $|\text{⏑} \lor \lor | \lor - | \text{⏑} \asymp$ .35%

The δ caesura always occurs; the ϵ may occur as well.

> δ admittere uiderentur, II 25.
> $\delta\epsilon$ animantia uel arbusta, XII 14.

---

[11] That a word of the form $\lor \_ \text{⏑} \asymp$ received a secondary accent on its first syllable is only, so far as I know, an assumption. It is at least a highly probable one; this would be the third mora before the primary accent.

[12] Cf. Zielinski, Das Ausleben des Clauselgesetzes, Philologus, S. B. 10, 1907, p. 434; and di Capua, Le clausole in S. Agostino, *Bolettino di Filologia Classica*, 19. (1912-13), p. 14.

A3i. | ⌣ ⌣ – | ⌣ – | ⊥ ≍   .65%

The δ caesura always occurs; others sometimes occur with it.

αδ   fuerant secuturae, XIII 15.
δε   sacrilegas et euertit, X 11.

T3i. | ⌣ ⌣ ⌣ | ⌣ – | ⊥ ≍   .20%
δε   inferior an aequalis, XII 6.

M3i. | ⊥ – – | ⌣ – | ⊥ ≍   .05%
αγδ   ipsi non recesserunt, X 16.

D3p. | ⊥ ⌣ ⌣ | ⌣ ⌣ | ⊥ ≍   .65%

The δ caesura always occurs.

δ   terrestria moriantur, XIII 17.

A3p. | ⌣ ⌣ – | ⌣ ⌣ | ⊥ ≍   .75%

The δ caesura is always found; the ε once.

δ   constitui prohibebat, I 32.
αδε   cupidos et auaros, I 8.
T3p.   cf. 1¹².

Truncated Clausulae.

[2]   ⊥ – ⌣ ≍   4.70%

By this symbol I indicate a form of clausula which is itself out of harmony with the general scheme, but in its origin is doubtless a remnant of Type 2. It is of common occurrence in the later writers, and is acknowledged generally by those who have studied their clausulae.[13] De Jonge describes it as a truncated form of 2.[14] I think this is certainly right. Type 2ε occurs frequently in Cicero, and must have the accents on the third and fifth syllables. As the importance of accent increased it came about that only so much of 2ε was recognised as a clausula as was controlled by the accents. Naturally, often ⊥ – ⌣ ≍ occurs preceded by a trochee.

[13] Steeger, *Die Clauseltechnik Leos des Grossen,* does not acknowledge this form. At least I am unable to find any account of it in his scheme of classification. And I find mention of only four or five cases that could belong to it.
[14] *Les clausules métriques dans S. Cyprien,* p. 125.

In this case we have a metrically perfect 2. I have indicated these by employing only one of the square brackets. So [2 is $|- \cup \perp |- \cup \times$. About 35% show this metrically perfect form. I have lettered the caesurae to correspond with the ancient and complete form. But it must be borne in mind that this is a matter solely of historical interest. The clausula as it appears in St. Augustine, as for a century and a half before him, is $\perp - \cup \times$. The ε caesura is of the essence of the form; a third of the cases have the γ as well, and a few the δ.

[2ε   felicitatem putant, XXI 17.
[2aε   litterarum locis, XIII 24.
[2]ε   gustauerunt eam, XXI 24.
[2]γε poenas luit, XII 3.
[2]γδε hoc quod dedit, XXI 11.

$[2]^2$ $\cup\cup - \cup \times$ .95%

If the form $\perp - \cup \times$ be admitted, as it must, as forming a clausula, I see no reason for refusing to admit its resolved forms, and have therefore so classified the few cases that occur.[15]

$[2]^2$ε. iudicio Dei, II 24.
$[2]^2$γε homines Dei, X 19.
$[2^{12}$γε (deseruit) animam Deus, XIII 15.

$[2]^3$ $\perp\cup\cup \cup \times$ .40%

$[2]^3$γε tempore fuit, XII 16.

[3] $\perp - \cup \perp \times$ .85%

On the analogy of the foregoing I have so classified the form $\perp - \cup \perp \times$, which is recognised as a clausula generally by those who have studied the metres of late writers. Similarly it is to be explained as developed from 3ε. About 25% of the cases are preceded by a trochee, making a metrically perfect 3ε. These are designated [3. Those cases where this trochee has its first syllable accented are good 3 forms, even in St. Augustine, and are, therefore, not included here.

[3aε   spiritalem futuram, XIII 20.
[3]ε   sanctorum suorum, XXI 18.

---

[15] Resolutions of syllable 1, since this syllable is outside the clausula, are not given here; they are enumerated, however, in the list, p. 22.

[3]² ⌣⌣– ⌣�– ≍   .10%

    [3]²γε potuit taceri, I 6.

[3]³ ⌐⌣⌣ ⌣⌐ ≍   .05%

    [3]³ε   radicitus inhaeret, XI 9.

[3]⁴ ⌐– ⌣⌣⌣ ≍   .05%

    [3¹⁴ε   adminiculari memoriam, X 1.

Cadences.

Whether Types 4, 5, 6, 7 and higher are to be recognised here is open to question. Certainly their cadences are good Augustinian clausulae. But as these occur about half the time without the base, it will, perhaps, be most accurate to recognise only the cadences, attributing the occasional presence of the base partly to accident and partly to unconscious imitation of those writers who used these longer forms deliberately. With these I class the cadence of 3 where it occurs without the base. The following laws are worthy of notice. A spondee may be used for a trochee in any naturally trochaic foot. A tribrach likewise may be substituted for any trochaic foot. An iambus may be substituted for a trochaic foot of forms 4 and 6, and for any trochaic foot except the first and the last in 5 and 7. And it may perhaps be admitted even here, but there are not enough cases to show this with any certainty. It may be noted that this last rule constitutes a difference of function between final ⌣–⌐≍ and final –⌣⌐≍. The number designating the various types is used enclosed in parentheses to indicate the cadence without the base, while the number alone indicates the clausula in its full theoretical form. Here I include together the forms with base and those without, except, of course, in the case of Type 3.

(3). |–⌣|⌐≍   .60%   variations 1.05%

    The caesura is generally δ, but γ, ε, ζ and η occur.[16]

        (3)δ   ut hic non corrigatur, XXI 13.
        (3)γ   euaderetis, I 34.

---

[16] The caesurae are lettered to correspond with those of the corresponding complete forms.

(3) sδ   sed interponit, X 23.
(3) sδζ homo Christus Iesus. XI 2.
(3)³δζη utique non sunt, X 1.
(3)⁴sγ incorruptibilis, XII 3.

(4). |−⌣|⌣⌣≍ .65% Variations 2.05%

The caesura is δ; ε, ζ, and η occur. The form (4)i undoubtedly owes its origin, at least in part, to the form 2β.

4δ   frequentissimā multitudine, II 4.
4³δζη   iniquius rapere non datas, II 17.
(4)δε   hoc uidebimus, II 21.
(4)sδζ multo sanguine, II 24.
(4)iδζ suo gloriam, XII 4.

(5). |⌣⌣|⌣⌣|⌣≍ 1.25% variations 2.30%

The regular caesura is ζ; others occur.

5ttαβζη non creatura sed Creator, XIII 24.
(5)ttζ   futura nuntiabant, X 32.
(5)ttδεη et tamen creatos, XII 16.
(5)ttδε non calumnientur, I 15.
(5)tiδζ esse coaeternum, XII 16.
(5)stζ   baptismum peruenire, XIII 7.
(5)siδζ uesci uiderentur, XIII 22.
(5)tiδζθ ante Deum diues, I 10.
(5)tsδη ceteros ignorat, XII 19.
(5)⁵tsδθ uniuerso populo, II 21.

(6). |⌣⌣|⌣⌣|⌣⌣≍ .20% variations .65%

6αγδζ   rerum est ordo transeuntium, XII 4.
(6)⁴tδζ pură beneficentia, X 10.
(6)ttδζ esse conprehenditur, XIII 11.
(6)tsδηθ omnium cui seruiunt, X 16.

(7) |−⌣|⌣⌣|−⌣|⌣≍ .60% variations .70%

This trochaic dimetre is to be recognised as a good clausula. It should have the θ caesura, but others are found. Resolutions hardly occur.

(7)tttθ   resurrectione mortuorum, XXI 8.
(7)tttδεθ uel dolore saeuiente, I 27.
(7)ttiδθ altitudo ruinosa, XXI 16.

(7)sttδζ   quasdam sanctimoniales, I 16.
(7)tstη   negotium deceptionis, II 26.

Whether the tribrach is to be admitted as a base is a question
which, in the last analysis, each one will answer for himself. Its
extreme rarity in Types 1 and 2 is a good argument on the nega-
tive side. It can occur only in a position where an additional tro-
chaic foot, in this case resolved, is perfectly admissible. The form
$|\smile\smile\smile|-\smile|\perp\asymp$ (*aliquid audeamus*) can be described as (5)³; and
the frequency of the 5 forms is sufficient to justify this. The only
difficulty is the great disproportion of resolutions in this position,
compared with the number found in syllables 4 and 5. We have
45 cases of (5)³ against only 2 cases of (5)⁴ and 9 of (5)⁵. I do
not think that any theoretical decision of any value can be made
on this question. The tribrach owes its frequency in this position
to the fact that the position may belong to a cretic (Type 3) which
it resembles in rhythm, or to a trochee (Type 5) which it resem-
bles in metre. In particular, it is impossible to decide the exact
nature of $\smile\smile\smile\ \smile\smile\perp\asymp$ (*numerus animarum*), whether it is 1¹² or
T3p. As a matter of fact, it does not belong to either, but to both,
variations of two different types having met in this form.

What took place is somewhat as follows: While *confiteatur*
probably never had the slightest secondary accent on its second
syllable, and the same could be said of the corresponding syllable
of *non fateatur,* the case is not the same with *testibus fateatur.*
Of course, *fateatur* would not have had the same distinct secondary
accent as *confitetur*; but it is at least possible that it had some
accent of the kind.[16a] If this is true, as the importance of accent
increased and the importance of quantity decreased the resem-
blance of *fateatur* to *diceretur* on the one hand and to *moneretur*
on the other must have grown stronger. In Symmachus we find
that *moneretur* and *diceretur* have become practically interchange-
able, that is, for the purposes of the clausula, they are variants of
the same thing. And where *dicebatur* occurs as a final it also
enters into the same combinations. In many writers, from the
first century down, final *diceretur* and *dicebatur* are treated alike.
These three forms follow a base that is cretic, anapaest or dactyl,
rarely a tribrach.[17] We have then on the one hand:

[16a] Cf. Lindsay, *Latin Language*, pp. 159, 161.
[17] Cf. Havet, *La prose métrique de Symmaque*, pp. 36, 37.

$$
\left. \begin{array}{|ccc|} | & \acute{} & \smile & - & | \\ | & \acute{} & \smile & \smile & | \\ | & \smile & \smile & - & | \\ |(& \smile & \smile & \smile)| \end{array} \right\} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{|cc|cc|} |- & \smile |\acute{}\smile| \\ |- & -|\acute{}\smile| \\ |\smile & -|\acute{}\smile| \end{array} \right.
$$

as one type of causula, and on the other, as a different type:

$$
\left. \begin{array}{|cc|} |\acute{} & \smile | \\ |\smile & \smile | \end{array} \right\} \quad |\smile\smile\acute{}\smile|
$$

The use of Type (5) adds the trochee to the possible " bases " of
the first type. And with it the two types of tetrasyllabic finals
fall together in that all four can enter into the combinations:

$$
\left. \begin{array}{|cc|} |\smile & \smile | \\ |\acute{} & \smile | \end{array} \right\} \quad |\smile\smile\acute{}\smile|
$$

A natural result is to put $\smile\smile\acute{}\smile$ to some degree into the same
class with $-\smile\acute{}\smile$, $\smile-\acute{}\smile$ and $--\acute{}\smile$, which I am assuming it
had come to resemble in accent. This makes possible, by a sort of
contamination, the forms:

$$
\left. \begin{array}{|ccc|} |\acute{} & \smile & - | \\ |\acute{} & \smile & \smile | \\ |\smile & \smile & - | \end{array} \right\} \quad |\smile\smile\acute{}\smile|
$$

which are far too frequent in St. Augustine to be corrected or con-
demned. This is the only cause which I can suppose to account
for the rise of this curious form. It is not a very satisfactory
cause, but the form is not one which has much pretension to be
rated as good, as these percentages will show:

$$
\left. \begin{array}{|ccc|} \acute{} & \smile & - | \\ \acute{} & \smile & \smile | \\ \smile & \smile & - | \end{array} \right\} \; |\smile\smile\acute{}\smile| \quad 2.05\% \quad |\smile\smile\smile\;\smile\smile\acute{}\smile| \quad .80\% \quad |\acute{}\smile\;\smile\smile\acute{}\smile| \quad 3.50\%
$$

as compared with:

$$
\left. \begin{array}{|ccc|} |\acute{} & \smile & - | \\ |\acute{} & \smile & \smile | \\ |\smile & \smile & - | \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{|cc|} |- & \smile\acute{}\smile \\ |- & -\acute{}\smile \\ |\smile & -\acute{}\smile \end{array} \right. \quad 17.20\% \qquad |\smile\smile\smile \left\{ \begin{array}{|cc|} |- & \smile\acute{}\smile \\ |- & -\acute{}\smile \\ |\smile & -\acute{}\smile \end{array} \right. \quad 2.25\%
$$

$$
\left. \begin{array}{|cc|} |\acute{} & \smile | \\ |\acute{} & - | \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{|cc|} |- & \smile\acute{}\smile \\ |- & -\acute{}\smile \\ |\smile & -\acute{}\smile \end{array} \right. \quad 4.30\%
$$

In this connection is to be noted a form, of too rare occurrence to be worth much as evidence, in which the pyrrhic seems to take the place of a trochaic foot. *Aegyptiā sapientiā* (⏑ ⌣ – | ⌣ ⌣ | ⏑ ⌣ –) looks like 4pδ; I have noticed two or three other similar cases; but I have classed these as dubious.

The following are the sentence-endings which I have left unclassified. It will be noticed that a good number of them would admit of classification if we allowed the iambus in every position in the cadences of 3, 5 and 7. Perhaps these together with 1i, 3i and 4i ought to be recognised as constituting a small but respectable class of ascending metres.

nisi quae non est.

fieri potest ut ita sit.

sperantibus in eum.
qui non sperant in eum.

summa eius, quod est nouem.
incommutabile, quod est Deus.

sic non hoc est quod habet.
quo ipsi boni erant.

qui non est quod ipse.
quae non est quod ipsa.
non fecit nisi ipse.
non aliquid ab eo, sed ipsum.

perfecit Deus opera sua.

propriā quisque malus est.

finis est adhaerere Deo.
est non adhaerere Deo.
potius bonae uoluntatis.
et hoc ipse homo est.
bonum est causa mali.

peperere suo.
gignendo parens.
experitur homo.

stultius nihil potest.
etiam dolor potest.
faciat opus malum.
putari nihil potest.
tamquam malum bono,
malis mala et bonis bona.
non inest, nisi ubi nocet.

amatur quod amandum est.
quidquid boni amamus.

publicam rĕgi non posse.
in quo Deus non esset.

mortuus erit non moriens.
manus quam digitus.
manus et digiti.

ingenio penetrabile.
Aegyptiā sapientiā.

naturae sunt, bonae sunt.
legant qui, uolunt.

CHAPTER IV.

Prosody Accent Etcetera.

Monosyllables.

Final monosyllables not forms of *sum* hardly occur. I have encountered the following:

alterum ergo nec te.	I, 39, 8 [1]
potissimum fit.	I, 47, 24
aliunde nos.	X 1 end.
hoc ipsum, nosse me.	I, 551, 12
deorsum faciat cor.	II, 32, 11
participatione sunt di.	II, 33, 7
non in se sed in te.	II, 564, 3

Monosyllabic parts of *sum* occurring finally, except after another monosyllable, do not enter into the clausula; this ends on the preceding syllable, which is anceps.[2] This principle is not universally admitted, but in the *De Civitate Dei* we must either admit it or admit to our classification a new series of forms to include these finals; and that simply amounts to the same thing more clumsily described. *ipsa conuersa est, unus amborum est, esse confessus est, pace secura sit, ista perpessi sunt,* are all alike Type 1γ.

Accent of monosyllables.

Monosyllables not final can apparently always be equivalent to an accented syllable. This seems to include even *est, sunt* etcetera following its subject; though these are unquestionably preferred in the position where the accent does not fall. Furthermore, the majority of such monosyllables are prepositions or the negative. The following occur as cretics: *cum deos, dis suis, non ferens, non potest, non habet, quid uelim, non erat, uos superb(i), in fide, a bono, in Deo, hoc idem, sed dies, sed sibi, sed tamen, et tamen;*

---

[1] The references are of two sorts: those to chapter endings or chapter titles are by book and chapter; those to sentences within a chapter are by volume, page and line in Hoffmann's edition.

[2] Cf. Havet, *Prose métrique de Symmaque,* p. 66 ff.

and the following: *quid Cato* (‒ ⏑ ⏑), *se coli pro Deo* (‒ ⏑ ‒ ‒ ⏑ ×), *non necessarium* (‒ ⏑ ‒ ‒ ⏑ ×), *hoc ipsum* (‒ ‒ ‒), *si quis auderet* (‒ ⏑ ‒ ‒ ×), *non pro peccato* (‒ ‒ ‒ ‒ ×), *ut bene* (‒ ⏑ ⏑), *hoc sacrificium* (‒ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ×), *fit sacrificium* (‒ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ×), *hoc mutabilia* (‒ ‒ ‒ ⏑ ⏑ ×), *est et non* (‒ ‒ ‒), *in capite* (‒ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑), *in potestate* (‒ ⏑ ‒ ‒ ×), *nec si uelint* (‒ ‒ ⏑ ×), *non est* (‒ ×), *non sunt* (‒ ×) etcetera.[3] These same monosyllables occur as readily in positions where they do not have the accent.

Accent of Compound words.

The incidence of the accent shows that certain compound words which are printed as word groups should be pronounced as single words: *quodám modo religentur,* 3δ, XVI 2 end; quem ád modum facta, 1δ, XI 21 title; *huiús modi non haberent,* 3δε, I, 608, 15; *huiús modi coleretis,* 3pδ, I, 55, 8; *eliquari quodám modo,* M2γ, II, 497, 4; *huiús modi conueniret,* 3δ, II, 583, 18; *si quid eiús modi,* 2αβγ, II, 622, 17; *fuisse quodám modo,* 2γ, II, 508, 30.

Quantity.

Final *o* except in the dative and ablative of nouns, adjectives and pronouns is always short. Feminine nouns in -*io* must, from the position of the accent, have the *o* in a position where a long syllable is preferred. The only exception to this that I have noted is *sanctificatio sonat.* [2][3], I, 559, 6. But in these positions a short vowel is possible, and therefore in these words I always scan the *o* short, on the analogy of other words ending in *o*; since the above mentioned fact renders these words worthless as evidence. Omitting the cases where *o* is the final syllable of the clausula, and therefore anceps, and the above mentioned cases where it is long, out of 94 cases, 11 are feminines in -*io* and therefore need not be taken into consideration; in 64 the *o* occurs in a position where a short syllable is so much preferred that to count it as long would be impossible;[4] in 16, where a short is slightly to be preferred, not strongly enough to make the evidence of great weight; in one case, where a long is preferred but a short is admissible; and in 2

---

[3] Cf. Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 168.

[4] While a long syllable is found occasionally in these positions, it is not possible that out of a total of 106 such longs, 64 should be formed by a final *o*, and only 42 by all the other possible combinations together.

cases only, where a short syllable gives a distinctly poor form. I have scanned it short in every case. Examples are:

Feminines in *-io: resurrectio praedicatur,* D3, XXII 9 end; *quaestio nos fatiget,* D3, XV 15 end; *ratio concinnatur* T3s, VII 19 tit.

Short syllable much preferred: *resistendo permittere,* 2γ, XXI 15 end; *aliquando claudamus,* 1γ, XI 34 end; *ordo nascentium,* 2γ, V 5 end; *quando sit uiuens,* 1$a\gamma\delta$, XIII 9 end; *caro mutabitur,* A2$a\gamma$, XXII 21 tit.; *Varro perspexerit,* 2$a\gamma$, XIX 1 tit.; *ordo contexitur,* 2$a\gamma$, XVI 12 tit.; *sermo reuocauit,* 1$^2a\gamma$, XV 7 tit.; *omnino reticeret,* 1$^2\gamma$, VI 2 tit.; *cupido regnandi,* 1γ, I 31 tit.; *nemo damnabitur,* 2$a\gamma$, II, 551, 27; *ambo currebant,* 1$a\gamma$, I, 626, 19; *libido metuitur,* D1$^3\gamma$, I, 32, 9; *peccando recesseramus,* D3γ, I, 555, 14; *pulchritudo conponitur,* 2γ, I, 538, 7; *profecto credendi sunt,* 1γ, I, 531, 16; *credo raptas Sabinas,* 3$a\gamma\epsilon$, I, 81, 8.

Short syllable slightly preferred: *ideo sanum,* (3)^3, XIV 9 end; *ista est ergo nulla est,* 3, I 27 end; *Varro fabulosam,* (5), VI 10 tit.; *altitudo ruinosa,* (7) tti, II, 547, 20; *paenitendo destruatur,* (7), II, 561, 23; *alterum ergo nec te,* D3, I, 39, 8; *ordo transeuntium,* (6), I, 571, 16.

In the case of *quid Cato senserit,* I 5 tit., we have D2 a much poorer form than 2, which we would have if the *o* could be scanned as long.

In two cases, *quaerendo suum,* XIV 13 end, and *gignendo parens,* I, 618, 2, we have the very poorest sort of clausula, whereas a long *o* would give a good one.

In regard to the following quantities the evidence available is too slight to prove anything. The only proof of a quantity that can be drawn from a system of metres so free as that we have to deal with here, is by proportion, as in the case of the final *o*. That it is short is really demonstrated. Of the other quantities discussed no such proof can be given. I state what I believe to be the fact, and my belief is based on observation; but that is as much as can be said; and I give a few examples to show what the cases occurring are like. The words in question are not common in or near pause; and many of the cases that do occur are absolutely

indeterminable as to metre. The word *religiosos* occurs several times as a final where the first syllable may equally well be either long or short. For all of these quantities I have examined the whole of the *De Civitate Dei,* and of not one of them have I found enough cases really to prove anything. Of the perfect subjunctive second person plural I have not found a single example.

Final *a* is short in *contra* as it is in Ausonius, 469, 16. e. g. *contra naturam est,* 1αγ, I, 567, 30; *contra Varronem,* 1αγ, VI 6, tit.; but in many cases it occurs in a position which gives no evidence as to its quantity.

I find no evidence that final *a* is short in the other adverbs.

The *i* of the genitive is short in *ipse,* and probably in all other pronouns of the same type.

e. g. *ipsius plenitudo,* 3, XXII, 18 tit.; *ipsius spectant,* 1, XVII, 17 tit.; *ipsius opinantur,* 3i, IV 9, tit.; *non habent ipsius,* 2, I, 495, 14; *ipsius actionis,* D3, I, 495, 2.

and: *illius ciuitatis,* 3, II, 551, 4; *unius Dei adserunt,* 4i, VI 13 tit.; *illius caedis,* 1, I, 152, 15; *unius multitudo,* 3, II, 163, 4; *illius poetae,* (5), I, 222, 12.

but: *unīus auctoris,* 1, VII 30 tit. To scan the *i* short here would give (5)ti with the second accent out of place. This occurs when the second foot is a trochee or a spondee, but I have not found it with the iambus. Similarly: *ipsius aetatis,* II, 473, 5.

illīus alienius, I, 72, 10, is not conclusive, since *Aegyptiā sapientiā,* I, 467, 17, and *ingenio penetrabile,* I, 505, 32, are found.

The *i* of the perfect subjunctive and future perfect first person plural is long.

e. g. *putauerimus obscura,* 1γ, XX 17 end; *iudicium uenerimus,* Λ3δ, II, 428, 1; *Domino uenerimus,* A3αδ, II, 79, 23; *illo fuerimus,* M1²αγ, II, 476, 19; *nosque nouerimus,* (5)ζ, I, 371, 4.

but: *non tenuerimus,* I, 251, 5; and *si tenuerimus,* I, 251, 6, 1²αβ, are worse than doubtful.

The first syllable seems to be long in *religo, religio,* and *relinquo,* but this of course means that the *l* is doubled rather than that the *e* is long.

e. g. *quodam modo religentur,* 3, XVI 2 end; *uera religio,* 1³, X 19 tit.; *orta religio,* 1³, XVIII 8 tit.; *non relinquitur,* (4)s, I, 45, 14; *moriens relicturus.* A3s, I, 19, 14; *dilectione relinquitur,* 2, I, 521, 1. *Vir relinquatur,* VII 24 end, seems to be in contradiction, but it is to be taken as M1*αβ*.

One or two other probable quantities may be noted: *ante Bāhal,* XVII 22 end, and *ex Ādam sunt s*(*i*) *homines sunt,* M1³, XVI 8 end.

Metrical Licences.

Quattuor seems to be a dissyllable in *quattuor ut dictum est,* XV 10 end.

Synezesis perhaps occurs in the following:

sancti Deum uidebunt.
filium suum promisit.
tactu suo adurere.

The combination of mute and liquid seem to make position or not with perfect freedom according to metrical convenience.

In the following cases the syllable is certainly long:

seruus est propriae libidinis, 6.
fortuna muliebri, M1².
languore cum macra sunt. 1.
patris sui. [2].

and in the following it is certainly short:

arbitror disserendum. 3.
iam supra diximus. 2.
debeat sacrificari. 3³.

But in the majority of cases it is found in a position where either a long or a short syllable is admitted. I have scanned it as long where to do so gave a decidedly better clausula, *e. g.* 1 instead of A1 or D1; otherwise I have scanned it as short, *e. g.* A3 or D3 and not 3.

Words having variant forms.

The compounds of *prehendo* seem always to have the dissyllabic root *prehend-* rather than *prend-,* without regard to any metrical considerations.

5

e. g. non potest adprehendi.   3.

    scientia conprehendi.   3.

In the following cases the uncontradicted form gives a good clausula but the contracted form would have given a better:

    esse conprehenditis.   (6).

    utrumque conprehensum est.   (5).

Perfects in *-ivi* and *-ii* seem not to vary for a given verb.   And *noverunt,* but *nosse, nossemus* seem to be preferred, likewise independently of metrical suitability.

But in general, between two possible forms of the same word, as *nihil, nil; putaverunt, putarunt,* the MSS. show in a given instance that form which gives there the better clausula.   Some exceptions to this general rule are found, and they are difficult to account for; but the rule operates in the vast majority of cases, showing that the choice between the two forms was determined by the exigencies of metre.

nihil:

    esse si nihil, 1i, XI 26 end.   *Nil* would give (3), which is a poorer form, with a false accent.

    Saturno nihil dixerit, (6)si, VII 19 end.   *Nil* would give M2.

    numerositas nihil iuuerit, 4i, III 12 tit.   *Nil* unmetrical.

    temporalium nihil pereat, 3^4i, I 10 tit.   *Nil* would give $(5)^5$ with a very poor caesura.

    nihil occurrit, A1, I, 576, 7.   *Nil* would give (3)s.

    putari nihil potest, (dubious) I, 574, 9.   *Nil* would be still worse.

    quaeratur, nihil inuenitur, $M3^2$, I, 574, 2.   *Nil* would seem to be preferable here.

    efficiens, nihil est. $[2]^2$, I, 574, 4.   *Nil* impossible.

    stultius nihil potest, (dubious) I, 516, 8.   Apparently *nil* would be better here.

but:

    negata nil adimit, 1^3, I 12 tit.   *Nihil,* much poorer, 1^{23}.

siue:

    haberent siue non haberent, (5), IV 28 end.   Probably better than M3.

    siue felicium, 2, IV 3 tit.   Better than (4)s.

siue breuioris, 1², I 11 tit.   Better than D1.

siue dedecoris, 1³, I 17 tit.   Better than (3)⁴s.

siue non factas, 1, II, 554, 25.   Better than (3)s.

siue post mortem, 1, I, 628, 16.   Better than (3)s.

intellegunt siue credunt, 3, I, 562, 18.   Better than (5)s.

but :

bona seu mala est, [2]², I, 624, 28.   *Siue* would give a form
that is not even classified.

perfect infinitive :

uoluntatemque mutasse, 1, XI 4 end.   Instead of (5).

poterat indicasse, T3, III 11 tit.

tardius ambulasse, D3, I, 626, 20.

The uncontracted form would give 1 but with the *a* caesura,
which is poorer than the forms occurring.

I do not find the unsyncopated form, but its absence is doubtless
to be accounted for by the fact that it would generally give a poor
clausula.

perfect indicative :

facienda putauerunt, (5)ti, VIII 12 end.   D1 with the γ
caesura is inferior to (5) with the ζ.

esse putauerunt, (5)ti, IV 12 tit.   Like the preceding.

seditiones excitauerunt, 1, III 24 tit.   There seems no reason
for the preference here.

but :

colendos putarunt, [3], XIX 9 tit.   Better than (5)si.

nominibus nuncuparunt, A3, VII 5 tit.   Better than 1*a*.

quod di non uindicarunt, M3, III 6 tit.   Probably better
than 1*a*.

minime dubitarunt, A3p, I, 101, 26.   Better than A1*a*.

sepeliendumque curarunt, 1, I, 26, 7.   Better than (5)ts.

cultoribus reportarunt, 3i, I, 477, 12.   Better than (3)s.

perfect subjunctive and future perfect :

Amos prophetauerint, (4)i, XVIII 28 tit.

ostentauerint adiutores, 3s, II 24 tit.   Better than (5)ss.

liberauerit Christus, 1δ, I 29 tit.   Better than (5)ts.

propinquauerit mox remittit, 3, II, 520, 25.   Better than
(5)st.

adeptamque seruauerint, 2γ, I, 88, 13. Not better, but more
   sonorous than 1γ.
communia disputarit, D3δ, XX 3 tit. Better than 4.
iudicio praedicarit, A3δ, XX 18 tit. Better than 4.
congruentia prophetarint, D3iδ, XVII 30 tit. Better than 4i,
   cf. *Amos prophetauerint.*
pronuntiarit ambiguas, 1³γ, VII 17 tit.

Elision and Hiatus.

The greatest liberty seems to exist in eliding or retaining a final
vowel before an initial vowel. Rules governing the practice can
hardly be said to exist, except that of avoiding the harshest form
of hiatus, that between two vowels of identical quality. The vowel
i seems to be regularly elided, to remain by exception. Finals in
-*m* seem to stand in hiatus more readily than those in sole vowels.
Of the vowels, *a* resists elision more than the others. But in gen-
eral the final syllable is elided or not according to metrical con-
venience; and in many cases it is impossible to decide whether
there is elision: although other things being equal there is some
tendency to prefer to elide.

Improper elision appears to me to exist. I am inclined to think
that e. g. *regno aeterno* has a closer relation to 1γ than to M1γ.
But, as this opinion is too radical to be advanced without stronger
evidence than it seems possible to draw from a work whose metrical
system is so liberal and so facile, I have everywhere scanned these
vowels as long; and *regno aeterno* is classified as M1. The follow-
ing cases may be of interest.

> nullā intemperanter, M3.
> illo a quo creata est, M3.
> iustificatae hinc emendatae, M3s.
> lux qua illuminantur, M3.

Elision of -*a* before *a*.

> spontane(a) adpetenda sit, (5).
> nomin(a) apparent, 1.
> Salaci(a) ac Venilia, (6).

-*a* before *au*.

> sequenda auctoritas, 2 or (5)st.

Elision of -*a* before *ae* and *e*.

> quando aetern(a) erit, 2.
> Mater Magn(a) et Ceres, M2.
> tempor(a) aeterna, 1.
> Fimbri(a) excidit, 1.
> poen(a) erit carnis, 1.
> uel mal(a) est quae iam non est, 3s.
> capt(a) et incensa est, 1.
> paru(a) emendauit, M1.
> terti(a) eius est, (3).

Hiatus with -*a* before *ae* and *e*.

> ista est ergo nulla est, 3.
> causa est sed uoluntas, 3.
> uisa est indicari, 3.
> haec est natura eius, M3.
> facta est perstitisset, 3.
> uita aeterna, 1.
> causa est sed dolendi, 3.
> uita aeternitas, 2.
> perdenda et recte, 1.
> facta est indicetur, 3.
> facta est adpetiuit, 3.
> nulla extr(a) ipsum sunt loca, 4s.

Elision of -*a* before *i*.

> nulla extr(a) ipsum sunt loca, 4s.
> omni(a) in omnibus, D2.
> uit(a) id est anima, 1^3.
> ips(a) incorruptio, M2.

Hiatus with -*a* before *i*.

> nullā intemperanter, M3.
> prophetā incredibilius est, $M3^4$.
> eadem uita ipse est, A3.
> lux qua illuminantur, M3.

Elision of -*a* before *o*.

> plurim(a) obfuscet, 1.
> offert, ips(a) offeratur, M3.

Hiatus with -*a* before *o*.

    Christiana obcresceret, 2.

Hiatus with -*a* before *u*.

    natura, doctrina, usus, 3.
    omnia unus est, D1.

Elision of -*ae*.

    anim(ae) et corporis, A2.
    priora uit(ae) huius, 1, or (5)ts.

Hiatus with -*ae*.

    omnia quae habebant, D3.
    iustificatae hinc emendatae, M3s.
    coronae aureae, (4)s.

Elision of -*e* before *a*.

    frugum adqu(e) arborum, 2.
    nomin(e) appellant, 1.
    libidin(e) adepta, D1.
    esse poss(e) arbitrentur, 3.
    ordin(e) aliena sint, 1².
    mentemqu(e) auertamus, M1.

Hiatus with -*e* before *a*.

    utriusque amore, D1.
    eorumque auctoribus, 2.
    inde acceperunt, (5)ts.

Elision of -*e* before *ae* and *e*.

    inpossibil(e) est infideli, A3.
    difficil(e) est inueniri, A3.
    soler(e) et augeri, 1.
    ips(e) et oblatio, 2.

Possible hiatus with -*e* before *e*.

    fuisse(e) existimant, (4)s, or 2.

Elision of -*e* before *i*.

    tamen et in s(e) ipsis, 1¹.
    corpor(e) intacto, 1.
    peccata s(e) ips(e) interemerit, 4.
    corpor(e) in morte est, 1.
    uincit nemp(e) istos, M1.

magna class(e) imperator, M3.

crimin(e) innectitur, 2.

Hiatus with -*e* before *i*.

fuisse intelleguntur, 3, or (5)st.

resurrectione inrident, 1, or (5)ts.

Elision of -*e* before *o*.

profecto s(e) occidere, 2.

sceler(e) occisus est, A1.

corpor(e) occiso, 1.

oriuntur adqu(e) occidunt, 2.

Hiatus with -*e* before *o*.

firmare opiniones, D3, or (5).

Elision of -*i* before *a*.

beat(i) aliunde nos, D2.

Theodosi(i) Augusti, A1.

corpor(i) adiunxit, 1.

anim(i) affectio, A2.

Hiatus with -*i* before *a*.

unius Dei adserunt, 4i.

Elision of -*i* before *e*.

popul(i) exhibeant, A1[3].

propagar(i) et augeri, 1.

iniustissim(i) et pessimi, 2.

uos superb(i) estis, 1.

uict(i) et inclusi, 1.

inuid(i) effecti sunt, 1.

coopert(i) et obpressi, 1.

sonabil(i) et temporali, 3.

Hiatus with -*i* before *e*.

filii eius Ioseph, 3s, or (5)ts.

Elision of -*i* before *i*.

laetar(i) in amentia, 2.

Elision of -*i* before *o*.

angel(i) hominibus, D1[3].

sequ(i) oporteret, A1.

praesent(i) homicidium, D2.
resolu(i) opinantur, 1.
Adam sunt s(i) homines sunt, M1[3].

Elision of -*o* before *a*.

diuin(o) adiutorio, M2.
diabol(o) ad Christum, A1.
esse nem(o) ambigat, 2.
fuisse nem(o) ambigat, 2.

Hiatus with -*o* before *a*.

cohortatio ad Romanos, D3s.
illo a quo creata est, M3.

Elision of -*o* before *ae* and *e*.

quand(o) erit moriens, 1[3].
consili(o) et argumento, T3s.
quart(o) Erichthonio, 1[3].
adprob(o) et laudo, 1.

Hiatus with -*o* before *ae* and *e*.

quando aetern(a) erit, 2.
homo ex puluere, A2.
nosse quo eundum sit, (5).
regno aeterno, M1.

Elision of -*o* before *i*.

futur(o) in praeteritum, M1[3].
miracul(o) inclusit, 1.

Hiatus with -*o* before *i*.

quam nec pro ipso, M1.

Elision of -*o* before *o*.

sacrificand(o) offendamus, M1.

Elision of -*am* before *ae* and *e*.

modesti(am) earum, D1.
anim(am) et corpus, A1.

Hiatus with, -*am* before *ae* and *e*.

uitam aeternam, 1.

Elision of -*am* before *i*.

> eti(am) intellegantur, A3.
> potius qu(am) inuocandos, A3.

Hiatus with -*am* before *i*.

> diuinam impertiat, 2.

Hiatus with -*em* before *a*.

> errorem addiderunt, (5).
> aeternitatem accidisset, (5).
> mortalem adtexerent, 2.

Elision of -*em* before *e*.

> miserabil(em) errorem, 1.

Hiatus with -*em* before *e*.

> mortem est non in morte, 3s.
> uirtutem exerceant, 2.
> lucem et tenebras, 1^3.

Elision of -*em* before *o*.

> homin(em) occidi, A1, or 1^1.
> homin(em) occidit, A1, or 1^1.

Elision of -*im* before *o*.

> priuat(im) opulentiam, D2, or 2^2.

Elision of -*um* before *a*.

> inmund(um) habent proprium, 1^3.
> iust(um) ab iniusto, 1.
> qui De(um) amauerit, D2.
> alior(um) animalium, D2, or 2^2.
> anim(um) a ciuibus, A2, or 2^1.

Hiatus with -*um* before *a*.

> multum absurdum est, 1.
> nostrorum apostolorum, D3.
> suum aduersus ipsum, A3.

Elision of -*um* before *e*.

> nobilissim(um) exemplum, 1.
> contrari(um) est bono, 1i, or D2.
> miracul(um) est homo, 1i, or D2.
> null(um) erat tempus, 1.

Hiatus with -*um* before *e*.

    uiuumque templum eius, (5), or 1.
    nullum est peruenitur, 3.
    intellegendum est si resurgent, 3.
    figuratum est sacramentum, 3i.
    bonum est excitemur, A3.
    angelorum et hominum, D1³.
    intellegendum esse, (5).
    caelum et terra, 1.
    suscipiendum est ne peccetur, 3s.
    alterum ergo nec te, D3.
    seruandum existimant, 2.
    eundum est non tenetis, 3.

Elision of -*um* before *i*.

    anim(um) intendat, A1, or 1¹.
    sacrament(um) id est sacrum signum est, 3.

Hiatus with -*um* before *i*.

    tantum id possumus, 2.
    multum inpari, (4).

CONCLUSION.

We have seen that clausulae exist in the *De Civitate Dei*. Wherever there is a pause, strong or weak, there we find the evidence of a care that the voice of a reader should take momentary leave of the flow of discourse by means of an harmonious cadence. These clausulae are at once metrical and rhythmical; that is they must comprise certain recognised and legitimate dispositions of the metrical elements, and must be pointed by word accents that coincide with the ictus of the metrical feet. Both the metrical system and the rhythmical system here employed embrace a wide variety of possible and allowed forms. There is no monotony in the wearisome repetition of a few excessively palpable metres. The art of concealing art is practiced by means, first of the large number of forms used, second by the variation of these forms through resolution, and third by the large percentage of weak and poor forms admitted, which, while they do not grate upon the ear, at the same time do not weary it by a too obvious perfection. And another purpose is at the same time served, namely, that of allowing greater ease and freedom to the writer, to the advantage of the naturalness and forcefulness of his style.

About eighty per cent. of all the clausulae belong to those types which recur with sufficient frequency to become familiar to the reader; about eighteen per cent. are either instances of the familiar types half hidden by a rare resolution, or are definitely inferior types which yet bear a relation to the stronger ones and fit into the same scheme of classification; the remaining two per cent. are very poor indeed from the point of view of theory, but at the same time are vaguely reminiscent of the good types. Rhythmical cross-similarities come in to assist in the generally harmoniousness of the effect by relating to one another metrical diverse clausulae.

There is considerable metrical licence, which consists chiefly in admitting a lighter foot to take the place of the heavier, or *vice versa*. The dactyl and anapaest may occupy a place that belongs to the cretic; the spondee and iambus, and perhaps the pyrrhic, may do the work of a trochee. The less the violence done to the perfect form by these changes, the more readily do they occur; and the fuller and more sonorous the clausula in its general composi-

63

tion, the more readily does it admit these licences. Especially, they are most easily allowed in those clausulae where the familiarity of the favourite caesura contributes to preserve the type. The rhythm also helps to maintain the clausula where a metrical divergence is introduced; and in one or two cases has made possible the development of surprising forms.

The caesura is of fundamental importance. Every type has its favourite caesura; and a weak form with the proper caesura in many cases makes a better clausula than an otherwise perfect form with a strange one. Several of the clausulae not only favour a particular caesura, but never are found without it; and some not only require it, but also with the rarest exception, exclude all others.

The clausulae which we find in the *De Civitate Dei* admit of classification according to their metre, their rhythm and their caesurae, into a complete and unified scheme. This scheme shows that fundamentally the nature of the clausulae is one. But this is only possible through the aid of historical comparison and researches into the antecedents of some of the individual forms. The *De Civitate Dei,* isolated, would baffle the investigator seeking to classify and synthesize its clausulae. The clausula system which is in operation here is not found in its full vitality, but in its decadence. Or, it is not so much a system that we find, as an agglomerate of elements descended and resulting from a system. It might be compared to a family in its third or fourth generation.

In this connection is to be recalled a particular point which constitutes a striking feature of the Augustinian clausula. This is the contamination between two forms. We find forms that have variations only to be accounted for by the influence of other forms; and we find minor forms that are variations or descendants, not of a single original and fundamental form, but at once of two, so that the same form ought to appear in two places in our scheme of classification.

To an editor or critic of the *De Civitate Dei* the clausulae can not be of any great assistance in the choice between variant readings, and still less in the emendation of a bad reading. The proportion of poor forms is too large and the individual good forms have each too many near neighbours differing only in the quantity of a single syllable, to make it possible to say that a given reading is to be rejected or preferred for metrical reasons.

The clausulae do, however, throw valuable light on certain matters of prosody and accent and the like. They show that compound words like *huius modi* and *quem ad modum* are to be accented as single words. They render it probable that a preposition or *non* with a following iambus was accented. In regard to the accent of words taken from the Greek, and the accent and quantities of Hebrew words, I have not been able to find any information of any value. Some divergencies from classical quantities in Latin words are in evidence, and they are all in accordance with what we already know of the practice of the fourth century. The verb form *fecerimus* has the penult long. On the contrary the pronouns *illius ipsius* and *unius* have the penult short. The final *a* of *contra* is short. Final *o* is short in adverbs, in the first singular of verbs and in the gerund, and in the nominative of nouns. Elision has not the universal prevalence of classical times. Hiatus must have been common in the speech of the fourth century, or at least was not shocking to a fourth century ear; and we find it most where we should expect it least, namely, before *est*. *Factum est* and *facta est* are normally trisyllables.

In regard to the style of the *De Civitate Dei*, the clausulae are not to a great extent a determining factor. In their interest a choice is made between two forms of the same word, but only where both forms had general acceptance. Simple and natural inversions of word order are used for metrical reasons, never any that are violent or strained. And the same spirit pervades the whole employment of metrical cadences in the book. They are constantly in evidence, but they are rather the natural turns of a style that is both vigorous and orderly, than the laboured devices of a meticulous artificer. St. Augustine wrote with care and with elegance, but he neither slavishly adhered to a rigid system of rules, nor limited his system to monotonous paucity of forms. He both proposed to himself a system embracing a wide variety, and permitted himself a generous freedom in the large use of its inferior types when to do so contributed to enhance the forcefulness or clarity of the expression of his thought.

VITA.

The writer of this dissertation, Reverend Graham Reynolds, was born at the State Agricultural College, Michigan, October 5, 1887. He was baptized on May 22, 1912. He was ordained a priest of the diocese of Los Angeles on June 2, 1917, at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City. His primary and secondary education was received principally in the common schools of Pasadena, California. He was for four years an undergraduate at Yale College, receiving the B. A. degree in 1910. For a year he studied at the General Theological Seminary in New York City. He spent five years at St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York. In 1918 he was appointed instructor in Latin in the Catholic University of America. Later he studied a year at the Institut Catholique of Paris and at the Sorbonne, attending the lectures of Rev. Paul Lejay, Rev. P. Rousselot, Professor Frédéric Plessis, and Professor Henri Goelzer, being admitted in June, 1919, by the Faculty of Paris, to the degree of Licencié ès Lettres. During the two years, 1919 to 1921, he was a resident member of Lincoln College, Oxford. There he attended the lectures of Professor A. C. Clark, Professor Gilbert Murray, Professor Joseph Wright, E. C. Marchant and F. W. Hall. At the Catholic University of America he has attended the lectures of Professor Roy J. Deferrari.